

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHERS'
PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL NEEDS AND
PERCEPTIONS OF MET NEEDS THROUGH
RESOURCE TEACHER SERVICES

AN ABSTRACT
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
SPECIALIST IN EDUCATION

BY
JOSEPHINE W. JACKSON

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
MAY, 1985

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to assess the possible relationships of language arts teachers' perceptions of their instructional needs and their perceptions of the services provided to them by resource teachers.

Methods and Procedures

The sample for this study consisted of 239 elementary language arts teachers, thirty-three middle school language arts teachers and fifty-six high school language arts teachers in the Atlanta Public School System.

A questionnaire developed by the researcher was designed to gain the opinions of classroom language arts teachers regarding (1) their perceived level of competency in four specific aspects of the teaching of reading, and (2) perceptions of help provided to them by language arts resource teachers.

The responses were analyzed using the Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation and chi-square to determine the statistically significant relationship at the .05 level.

Results

The findings indicated that the majority of elementary, middle and high school teachers rated themselves as having adequate to above average competency in the four

skills areas of reading assessment, classroom management, skill development, and techniques and strategies. The majority of teachers were also of the opinion that adequate services had been provided by resource teachers in the areas considered. This suggested that most teachers in the sample did not perceive a need for assistance in the areas measured and held the perception that resource teachers had provided services that were relevant to their needs.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHERS '
PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL NEEDS AND
PERCEPTIONS OF MET NEEDS THROUGH
RESOURCE TEACHER SERVICES

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
SPECIALIST IN EDUCATION

BY
JOSEPHINE W. JACKSON

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
MAY, 1985

R V

T 149

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Rationale	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Hypotheses	6
Significance of the Study	8
Assumptions	9
Limitations of Study	9
Evolution of the Problem	10
Definition of Terms	11
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
Studies Related to Teachers' Perceptions of Instructional Needs and Competencies	14
Studies Related to the Concerns and Needs of Beginning Teachers	28
Studies Related to Reading Assessment Instruments	38
Studies Related to Supervision	43
Summary of Related Literature	50
III. METHOD AND RESEARCH	56
Design of the Study	56
Research Design	56
Locale of the Study	57
Sample of the Study	59
Instrument Used to Collect the Data	60
Procedures for Implementing the Study	63
Analysis of Data	64
Statistical Treatment of Data	65
Summary	66

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA	67
Summary of Findings Related to Each Question . .	95
Discussion	97
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	102
Findings	110
Conclusions	112
Implications	113
Recommendations	114
APPENDICES	115
BIBLIOGRAPHY	141

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many persons to whom I am sincerely indebted for helping prepare this thesis. Without their help and encouragement, it would have been far more difficult to complete. I wish to express my thanks to my major advisor, Dr. Charles E. Davis, and Dr. Ruby Thompson for their careful and thoughtful guidance throughout my study at Atlanta University. Special acknowledgement goes to Dr. W. Coye Williams for his helpful advice, suggestions and cooperation as a committee member.

I am grateful to each person who assisted in the development of the questionnaire used in this study. I am also grateful to all teachers who were kind enough to complete and return the questionnaire and to Mr. Larry Watts for analyzing the data.

Mrs. Eloise Pittman deserves more credit than I can give for her professional assistance in typing, editing and preparing each phase of the thesis. Special thanks goes to Ms. Selena Bell for her expertise and pride in typing and proofing the final copy of this document.

Most importantly, I am grateful to my husband, Ernest, and our children, Candace, Ernest, Jr., Christa, and Caree, whose patience, understanding, love, and encouragement sustained me during the many days and nights spent in completing this project.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percentage of Return of the Questionnaire	60
2. Teaching Position and Competence in Assessment . . .	68
3. Teaching Position and Competence in Classroom Management	70
4. Teaching Position and Competence in Skill Development	71
5. Teaching Position and Competence in Techniques and Strategies	73
6. Educational Level and the Four Competency Areas	74
7. Teaching Experience and the Four Competency Areas	76
8. Courses Completed in Language Arts and the Four Competency Areas	77
9. Teaching Position and Services Provided in Assessment	79
10. Teaching Position and Services Provided in Classroom Management	81
11. Teaching Position and Services Provided in Skill Development	83
12. Teaching Position and Services Provided in Techniques and Strategies	84
13. Predictor Variable--Services	86
14. Predictor Variable--Services	87
15. Predictor Variable--Services	89
16. Intercorrelation Matrix of Areas of Perceived Competence and Services Provided	92

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Schools and school personnel exist because society has sanctioned the need to help individual students reach their potential and become independent learners. The key to independent learning lies in the ability to compute and to read, write and speak intelligently. Without these fundamentals, the grasp of other disciplines is extremely difficulty.

Today, attention is focused on education as it has not been since 1957 when the launching of the first Russian Sputnik caused Americans to ask why America had fallen behind Russia in science and technology. The answer given by many was that the education in science and mathematics provided by schools in the United States was inferior to that of the Soviet Union.

A current examination of our educational system reveals that language skills--believed by many to be of even more importance than mathematics and science--are all very much at risk.¹ Improvement in the literacy and other

¹John Mickler, "Reading Achievement in the United States," Journal of Reading XXV (May 1982): 760-762.

basic skills in being demanded by all sectors of the nation.

The classroom teacher holds the key to improved learning for students. Teachers comprise the largest group of professional staff in any school. While teachers are by no means alone in their influence on instruction, their impact on the quality of education is unparalleled. Teachers are expected to be competent, responsive and responsible individuals who can facilitate student learning and provide for the affective needs of students.

Developing informed, thinking citizens is a responsibility shared by all teachers. The Organization for the Essentials of Education sets forth this conclusion:

In all subjects, students develop skills in using language and other symbol systems; they develop the ability to reason; they undergo experiences that lead to emotional and social maturity. Students master these skills and abilities through observing, listening, reading, talking and writing about science, mathematics, history and the social sciences, the arts and other aspects of our intellectual, social and cultural heritage. As they learn about their world and its heritage, they necessarily deepen their skills in language and reasoning and acquire the basis for emotional, aesthetic and social growth.¹

Though the overall responsibility of developing informed, thinking citizens is shared by all teachers and

¹"A Statement of the Organizations for the Essentials of Education," The Reading Teacher 34 (May 1981): 936.

all subjects, the major task of helping students to become effective communicators remains the responsibility of the reading/language arts teachers. These teachers, therefore, are a critical link in the total instructional process. They are responsible for the most vulnerable area of American education. Words written by Gates in 1947 are still true today. He wrote:

Reading is both the most important and the most troublesome subject in the curriculum. It is the most important since it is a tool the mastery of which is essential to the learning of nearly every other school subject. It is the most troublesome since pupils fail in reading far more frequently than in any other elementary skill.¹

Today some twenty-three million American adults are functionally illiterate and about 13 percent of our teenagers (up to 40 percent of minority adolescents) are functionally illiterate. Ways for teachers to add continually to their understanding about the teaching of reading must be provided if youngsters are to benefit from improved reading instruction.

There are different approaches utilized for upgrading the skills of teachers. One of the ways used to help teachers is through well-planned inservice education programs. A basic question which always surrounds inservice training is: How do we determine the needs to be addressed

¹Author I. Gates, Improvement of Reading (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), p. 3.

by inservice programs? Do we just ask teachers what they need or do we use other measures which indicate the improvement needed? A review of the literature suggests that the teacher is of prime importance when designing an inservice program. Researchers indicate that inservice programs are more effective when they meet the needs of the group members and provide information which they need. Teachers want to be directly involved in matters affecting their professional lives and should be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of those activities.¹

Views of participating teachers must be taken into consideration in the attempt to upgrade the teaching of reading. However, it should not be the sole criterion used. Jones and Hayes suggest that asking teachers what they want may not produce an accurate assessment of needs. They suggest that alternative techniques such as observation, formal testing, and interviewing should also be used.² It has become increasingly clear that professional growth programs designed to bring about improved teacher competence must be relevant to teachers' needs and must include both supervisory and teacher input.

¹Ira Aaron, Bryon Callaway, and Arthur V. Olson, Conducting In-Service Programs in Reading (Newark: International Reading Association, 1965).

²Andrew E. Hayes and Linda L. Jones, "How Valid are Surveys of Teacher Needs," Educational Leadership (February 1980): 390-392.

In most school systems, persons who are directly involved with helping teachers improve the learning opportunities of children are referred to as instructional supervisors and/or resource teachers. These resource teachers play a major role in assessing and directing the growth activities of teachers. One of the challenging aspects of the supervisor-teacher relationship is the need for agreement regarding teacher growth needs. If the teacher does not admit to having a need, efforts to provide a program to meet the need will not be perceived as help and will likely be rejected. This underscores the need for a continuous and open communication flow between the teacher and supervisor. The resource teacher, therefore, must serve as a partner with the teacher in judging teacher growth needs and in developing a growth program to establish, maintain, or add to teacher competence. Resource teachers and other instructional supervisors have a responsibility for continually upgrading their knowledge of teacher needs and ways to meet those needs. It is on the strength of this principle that the study is supported.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study was that of determining the relationship between selected language arts teachers' perceptions of instructional needs and perceptions of met needs through resource teacher services.

The purpose of the study was two-fold: (1) to identify the selected teachers' perceived level of competency in selected instructional areas, and (2) to determine the teachers' perceptions of the help provided to them by resource teachers in those selected instructional areas.

Hypotheses

The following questions and hypotheses provided direction in carrying out the study. The .05 level of significance served as the decision rule.

- I. Is there a relationship between teachers' level of competence and their position, educational training, teaching position, and/or the number of courses completed in language arts/reading?
 - 1.1 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and their present position.
 - 1.2 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and their level of educational training.
 - 1.3 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and their years of teaching experience.
 - 1.4 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading.
- II. Is there a relationship between the amount of service provided by resource teachers and teachers' present position, educational training, teaching experience and/or courses completed in reading?

- 2.5 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of service provided by resource teachers and teachers' present positions.
- 2.6 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of service provided by resource teachers and teachers' educational training.
- 2.7 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of service provided by resource teachers and number of years of teaching experience by the teachers.
- 2.8 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of service provided by resource teachers and number of courses completed in language arts/reading.
- III. Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of assessment and the services provided in the area of assessment?
- 3.9 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' level of competence in assessment and services provided in assessment.
- IV. Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of classroom management and services provided in the area of classroom management?
- 4.10 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' level of competence in classroom management and services provided in classroom management.
- V. Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of skill development and services provided in the area of skill development?

5.11 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' level of competence in skill development and services provided in skill development.

VI. Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of techniques and strategies and services provided in the area of techniques and strategies?

6.12 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' level of competence in techniques and strategy and services provided in techniques and strategy.

Significance of the Study

The need for quality professional growth programs for reading/language teachers continues as a crucial concern for the 1980s. This concern comes in part from the call for accountability voiced by educators and citizens alike. They have pushed the concern for teacher competence into the fore front of public thought in America.

In addition, the decline in student enrollment and its impact on teacher employment patterns leaves many school districts with entire staffs of very "experienced" teachers. It is reported that three out of every four teachers who will be in the classroom in 1990 are teaching there today.¹ It is apparent that action taken to upgrade the skills of reading teachers now employed deserves more attention.

¹Elizabeth A. Dillion, "Staff Development: Bright Hope or Empty Promise?," Educational Leadership (December 1976): pp. 165-170.

It is hoped that the results of this study can be used to assist resource teachers and other staff developers in the language arts area in:

1. planning and implementing training which is the result of a multi-faceted view of need
2. determining topics of concern to teachers
3. structuring growth producing activities for beginning teachers
4. facilitating change and improvement in resource teacher services and activities which can result in positive professional growth for teachers
5. designing and improving courses in reading methods and content.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in carrying out this study:

1. Since this study is based on self report information, the accuracy of the data is dependent on the honesty and recollections of the respondents. Anonymity of the responses was employed to reduce the inaccuracy of responses.
2. It is assumed that low ratings (01-no competency, 02-limited competency) indicated a need for additional services in the areas under consideration. High ratings (03-adequate competency, 04-above average competency, 05-mastery) are assumed to indicate met needs or the absence of a needed service by resource personnel.

Limitations of Study

Limitations pertinent to this are as follows:

1. The research was conducted in only one administrative area of Atlanta Public Schools.

The school system is made up of three administrative areas. This suggests that different results may have been obtained if all areas of the school system had been involved.

2. Although the sample included teachers from three instructional levels--elementary, middle and high--the majority of the teachers represented the elementary level. Consequently, the findings may relate more to this group of teachers than the other two groups.
3. It is hoped that each respondent gave careful attention to each item of the questionnaire. However, it must be noted that where this was not the case, questionnaires which were carelessly completed were given the same consideration in the analysis of the data as those completed with care.

Evolution of the Problem

The problem of this study resulted from the writer's desire to strengthen current efforts of supervisory personnel aimed at improving the teaching of reading. The major goal of instructional supervisors has always been the improvement of the teaching/learning process. In general, urban school systems have employed personnel to assist teachers with the total instructional process. However, many urban school systems, such as Atlanta Public Schools, have gone further by employing personnel for the specific purpose of improving the reading program.

A major thrust toward the improvement of reading in Atlanta Public Schools began in 1970 with the employment of resource teachers with special training in the area of reading. These resource teachers focused most of their attention on improving the reading competencies of teachers

working at the primary level (grades one through three). Additional personnel were later assigned to each area under the Elementary, Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The writer was among the first persons assigned to work in this capacity.

Having worked as a reading resource teacher for the past eleven years, the writer was aware of the progress made in this area, but was also aware of the need to determine more effective means of helping teachers who are presently employed to improve their proficiency in the teaching of reading. Various research studies have shown that for a number of reasons, instructional supervisors and/or resource teachers have not spent the desired amount of time in classroom observations or staff development sessions and are not providing adequate feedback to teachers related to their teaching practices.

It was determined therefore, that a study which could provide information related to the specific strengths and weaknesses of reading/language arts teachers as well as information related to areas where services have been provided or should be provided could be most beneficial to the process of improving teacher competencies.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of clarification, the following basic terms are defined as they were used throughout this study.

1. Level of Competence--refers to the teacher's perceived level of knowledte as indicated by the self-rating responses (results) on The Teacher Needs and Resource Teacher Services Questionnaire.
2. Assessment--refers to a group of skills listed on The Teacher Needs and Resource Teacher Services Questionnaire (TNRTSQ) which identify diagnostic techniques important in the teaching of reading.
3. Classroom Management--refers to a group of skills listed on the TNRTSQ as being essential in organizing students and materials for reading instruction.
4. Skill Development--refers to a group of skills listed on the TNRTSQ as being essential in teaching students to read.
5. Techniques and Strategies--refers to a group of skills listed on the TNRTSQ as being essential in teaching students to read.
6. Resource Teacher Services--refers to specialized help provided to teachers in the area of language arts/reading by selected resource teachers of Atlanta Public Schools as indicated by items listed on The Teacher Needs and Resource Teacher Services Questionnaire.
7. Resource Teacher--staff personnel assigned to the area offices to provide instructional assistance to school faculties. They are often referred to by such titles as coordinator, director, consultant or curriculum specialist.
8. Relationship--is operationally defined as the degree to which correlation exists between two variables.
9. Supervision--the efforts to stimulate, coordinate, and guide the continuous growth of teachers so as to improve the quality of instruction.
10. Language Arts--refers to the teaching of one or all of the related skills of reading, writing, listening, speaking or English in general.
11. Teacher Growth Activities--those activities designed to insure the professional growth of teachers on the job.

12. Beginning Teacher--refers to a teacher who remains in the induction phase of teaching--the first three years of inservice experience.
13. Experienced Teacher--refers to a teacher who has completed four years or more in the teaching profession.
14. Elementary School--refers to a school having a curriculum offering work in any combination of grades K-7.
15. Middle School--refers to the school having a curriculum offering work in any combination of grades 6-8.
16. Secondary School (High School)--refers to the school division following the middle school, composed of grades 8-12 or 9-12.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature pertinent to this study reveals that considerable attention has been devoted to research in this area. The literature is reviewed under the following categories:

1. Studies related to teachers' perceptions of instructional needs and competencies.
2. Studies related to the concerns and needs of beginning teachers.
3. Studies related to reading assessment instruments.
4. Studies related to supervision.

Studies Related to Teachers' Perceptions of Instructional Needs and Competencies

The quality of reading instruction given by classroom teachers is of vital concern to those engaged in the areas of reading and of teacher education. The great differences which exist in the types of preservice education and in the professional experiences of teachers are well known. If children are to benefit from improved reading instruction, school districts must provide a continuous program of in-service education.

Problems connected with the teaching of reading which are of primary concern to the teachers themselves should provide the nucleus around which inservice education is developed. What are the instructional needs of classroom teachers? In what specific aspects of the teaching of reading do teachers feel the greatest need for additional learning? Adams attempted to answer these and other questions in a study designed for elementary classroom teachers.

Adams conducted a study aimed at determining the instructional needs of classroom teachers in the teaching of reading. The sample of teachers was drawn from among sixty white elementary public schools in Florida. Completed questionnaires were received from 268 teachers or 86 percent of the number which had been distributed.

Teachers were asked to indicate the degree of need they felt for learning about twenty-one aspects of the teaching of reading. The responses identified several aspects of reading instruction about which they felt the greatest need for learning. At least 90 percent of the responses indicated that teachers felt "great need" or "some need" for learning about corrective and/or remedial reading, diagnosis of reading problems, treatment of reading problems, and ways to meet individual differences and needs in reading.

The teachers' responses also identified several aspects about which they felt the least need for additional

learning. Teachers felt that they already had sufficient understanding about the library, purposes of grouping, ways to group, ways to attack new words and ways to secure books.

Adams reported that the results of this study indicated that elementary teachers needed better understanding of many aspects of the teaching of reading which fall under six major categories. The following aspects were among those needed:

1. the breadth of the reading program, enjoyment of reading, creative writing and instruction in reading in the content fields,
2. motivation and readiness with implications for classroom practices,
3. the nature and the extent of the individual differences of children,
4. the importance of providing opportunities for children to learn and to use the various reading skills,
5. the values and uses of a wide range of materials and resources, and
6. the nature and techniques of evaluation and the distinction between evaluation and testing.

Adams pointed out that teachers are not always aware of their needs. She suggested that a follow-up study in which the needs of teachers as revealed by questionnaire are checked against needs as revealed by classroom performance would be helpful.¹

¹Mary L. Adams, "Teachers' Instructional Needs in Teaching Reading," The Reading Teacher 17 (January 1964): 260-264.

Ingersoll and Schneider focused their attention on the perceived needs of elementary teachers in a study utilizing a revised version of the Teacher Needs Assessment Survey Instrument developed earlier by Ingersoll. In this study, the perceived training needs reported by teachers were compared with principals in the same school system.

The entire population of elementary school teachers in a consolidated school district in Monroe County, Indiana, was used as subjects for this study. In all, 219 elementary teachers and twenty-one principals responded to the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point scale whether they felt training in a specific teaching skill was needed.

Results of this study showed that perceived areas of need were rated differently by teachers and principals. Both groups indicated a training need in the domain of student-centered concerns. The general pattern of teacher responses implied little desire for training in the areas of discipline, classroom management and personal and interpersonal concerns. Principals, on the other hand, showed interest in inservice training in all of the areas included on the instrument. Ingersoll and Schneider stated that the difference between principal and teacher perceptions was evidence that more than teacher responses must be included during the decision-making process on inservice training.¹

¹Gary M. Ingersoll and Ruth A. Schneider, "Perceived Inservice Needs Among Elementary Teachers," Viewpoints: Teachers and Learning 54 (October 1978): 20-26.

A search of the literature in these areas indicates that a multifaceted view of inservice training must be taken. This view includes teacher responses and other means such as perceptions of principals and supervisors.

The preferences for pre-service and inservice training in the teaching of reading were examined in a study by Smith and Otto. The purpose of this study was to obtain guidelines for improving the pre-service and inservice training of elementary teachers to teach reading. Teachers were asked their preferences for certain approaches to inservice education. Each teacher in the seventeen elementary schools participating in this study was asked to complete a four-item questionnaire. Of the 308 questionnaires distributed, the data for the study were obtained from 225 teachers trained at the baccalaureate level.

Responses were analyzed according to grade level taught and years of experience. Results related to the two items on pre-service education indicated that primary teachers were more satisfied with their pre-service training than the intermediate grade teachers. It was further noted that pre-service experiences were ranked higher than their inservice experiences. Examination of the data on the specific needs of the teachers revealed that teachers on all experience levels expressed a need for additional information in the area of providing for the disabled reader. In addition, beginning primary teachers expressed a need for information on the superior reader as well.

One of the implications drawn from this study by the researchers is that inservice education programs should provide different experiences for teachers of different grade levels and different terms of service.¹

Jones and Hayes agree with other researchers that a thorough assessment of teacher needs should be undertaken before developing staff development programs but raise questions concerning the validity of self-perception measures used alone. Jones and Hayes conducted a research study to determine the extent to which teachers' perceptions corresponded with other data relating to experience and actual knowledge of reading instruction. The study was conducted in an urban school system and included eighty-six K-6 grade teachers from six schools. The Inventory of Teacher Knowledge of Reading and a questionnaire were used to measure the teachers' knowledge and perceptions of need in reading readiness word perception; comprehension and critical reading; differentiating instruction; silent and oral reading; evaluation, diagnosis and correction; and goals of reading instruction.

It was found that the greatest perceived needs for knowledge were in the areas of "differentiating instruction" and "comprehension and critical reading"; however, the degree of need perceived for these areas was only moderate.

¹Wayne Otto and Richard J. Smith, "Elementary Teachers' Preferences for Pre-Service and In-Service Training of Reading," The Journal of Educational Research 63 (July-August 1970): 445-449.

Correlations were computed: (a) between each of the seven areas of knowledge and the need for knowledge in those same areas; and (b) between the total needs measure and the percentage of correct responses indicating knowledge. Only one of the correlations was statistically significant. Overall, little relationship was found between expressed needs for knowledge and measured knowledge of reading.¹

Ingersoll provided what he considered a reliable and convenient format for school systems to gather data on inservice needs. The instrument, which he called a Teacher Needs Assessment Survey Instrument, contained seven clusters of teaching skills and was used in a survey study to determine the perceived training needs of 745 teachers.

Data were gathered from four systems and involved teachers of limited experience as well as those with years of experience. Levels taught by teachers included elementary, junior high and high school. The teachers were asked to indicate on a Likert-type scale whether or not inservice training in a specific area or skill would be beneficial.

The findings revealed differences among teachers in perceived needs within selected skill areas. In general, teachers reported perceived needs for training in the areas of individualized instruction and pupil development. Analysis of perceived needs for different sub-groups of teachers revealed changes in patterns of perceived needs.

¹Andrew E. Hayes and Linda L. Jones, "How Valid are Surveys of Teacher Needs," Educational Leadership 69 (February 1980): 390-392.

For example, elementary teachers were more prone to report perceived training needs in the area of individualization of instruction than either junior or senior high school teachers. On the other hand, secondary teachers reported training needs in the area of motivating students. Likewise, differences were observed in responses as a function of years of teaching experience. Newer teachers viewed discipline and classroom management as needed skill areas.¹ This finding is compatible in part with that advanced by Cruickshank et al.²

Braam and Walker replicated a survey which was conducted in 1964 by Braam and Roehm. The original survey sought to determine the extent to which subject matter teachers were aware of reading skills within their own subject area specialty. Braam and Walker wanted to determine if any discernible changes had occurred over a period of years. The same procedures and questionnaire were used. Questionnaires were mailed to the same sixteen schools included in the original survey. Teachers from the same subject areas were asked to respond to the same six questions. Unlike the original study, however, reading teachers and principals were requested to respond to the questionnaire.

¹Gary M. Ingersoll, "Assessing Inservice Training Needs Through Teacher Responses," The Journal of Teacher Education 27 (Summer 1976): 167-172.

²Donald Cruickshank, John J. Kenny, and Betty Myers, "Problems of Beginning Secondary Teachers in Relation to School Location," Journal of Educational Research 69 (January 1976): 167-172.

The questionnaire included the following three questions related to reading skills:

1. Which specific reading skills do you consider most necessary for your student in order for them to read the materials used in your subject area?
2. Which reading skills are your students best able to apply to the reading material in your subject?
3. In which reading skills are your students most deficient?

Respondents were also asked to indicate by a check of "Yes" or "No" whether:

1. they had received instruction in the teaching of reading in college courses and/or inservice training program,
2. there was a reading program in their high schools at the present time, and
3. there was one person designated as a reading teacher or specialist.

Responses were received from eighty-one teachers and principals. Researchers noted that the request to list skills considered necessary for students to read content materials drew responses which fell predominantly into the same ten skills categories as in the original survey. Comprehension remained the most important skill needed.

Examination of the total responses revealed an average of only 2.44 skills listed by each respondent as necessary in reading subject matter materials. There was an average on only .96 skills listed per respondent when asked to specify most competent skills observed in their

students and an average of 1.63 skills listed related to skills in which their students were least competent.

The content teachers saw students as most deficient in the same areas and rankings, as they indicated as being most necessary: comprehension, vocabulary, reading rate, critical reading and study skills. Reading teachers, on the other hand, saw students more deficient in critical reading.

The second set of questions related to the number of reading courses taken, existence of current reading program and the presence of a reading teacher within the school. The original study indicated that approximately 28 percent of the responding subject area teachers had either course work or inservice training in reading. The present study indicated that 28 percent had received similar instruction.

There was a noticeable reduction in reading programs and personnel when a comparison of the two survey responses was made. In the original survey 68 percent of the schools had reading programs and 73 percent reporting reading personnel. The current survey, only 41 percent of the same schools reported reading programs and 42 percent reported that the position of reading teacher or specialist was held by a member of the faculty.

The researchers concluded that subject area teachers are most aware of students' deficiencies than strengths and are unaware of the majority of reading skills needed by students to read successfully in the various disciplines.

It would appear that effective communication between reading experts and classroom teachers continues to be a problem.¹

Recent research indicates that more high school teachers are currently teaching reading than in the past. Jackson sent a questionnaire to 150 junior and senior high school teachers in four states to try to get closer to an answer to the question of whether high school teachers teach reading. The investigator was concerned with finding out how content teachers felt about teaching reading, what they were doing in their classes and whether or not they believed that a reading course should be required for all content teachers.

Seventy-eight percent of the questionnaires were returned by English, social studies, science and math teachers. Twenty-two percent were teachers of all other subjects taught in secondary schools.

The questionnaire contained thirty-three items. Five items sought information relating to teacher attitudes about reading. Slightly more than half of the respondents felt that although content teachers were experts in their areas, they were not the best person to teach the reading skills needed in the content area. Nearly three-quarters felt that content teachers could be reading teachers, but that the job would be done better by special reading teachers.

¹Leonard S. Braam and James E. Walker, "Subject Teachers' Awareness of Reading Skills," Journal of Reading 16 (May 1973): 608-611.

Four-fifths of the respondents indicated that all content teachers should complete a course in a secondary reading methods.

Ten items asked about instruction related to general reading skills. Responses suggested that in general, the respondents were using techniques associated with reading development.

The final section was designed to obtain information about specific skills taught in each content area. Results of the data showed that a majority of the teachers in most content areas were emphasizing reading skills in their teaching. English teachers appeared to stress finding the main idea, taught the functions of paragraphs, and said they read aloud to their classes. Social studies teachers reported giving instruction in reading maps, charts and graphs and used current materials in their lessons. Similar results were found in all content areas except mathematics. The researcher concluded that, based on the facts, nearly three-quarters of the respondents felt that content teachers could be reading teachers, more than two-thirds felt that they were reading teachers, and more than three-quarters were willing to take a course in teaching reading, secondary teachers have accepted the responsibility of teaching reading and understand that their students can benefit from reading instruction.¹

¹James E. Jackson, "Reading in the Secondary School: A Survey of Teachers," Journal of Reading (December 1979): 229-232.

A study, which resulted from an attempt by Bowling Green State University (BGSU) to develop and institute a plan for an inservice evaluation of its teacher education graduates, was conducted by Pigge for two main purposes. The major purpose of the study was to identify competencies needed in teaching, to analyze the reported proficiency of teachers in these competencies, and to determine where teachers received the greatest assistance in developing them. A secondary purpose was to share the questionnaire format, procedures, and the follow-up evaluation to facilitate replications of further refinement.

Initially, evaluation questionnaires were mailed to 2,400 BGSU graduates who were then teaching in Ohio. Of the 2,400 questionnaires mailed to teachers and their principals, 1,851 were returned from principals or supervisors and 770 from teachers themselves.

A two-part questionnaire was developed for the follow-up evaluation. The first part of the questionnaire consisted of twenty-six competency statements constructed by education faculty teaching the five required Bowling Green education courses. The second part consisted of competency statements developed by all faculty engaged in teaching courses within the students' major area of specialization. Thirty-one specialized sets of competency statements were produced to cover such teacher education majors as Biology, Elementary Education, Mathematics and Speech.

Participants in the study were asked to respond to all competency statements in four ways: need for the competency, use of the competency, proficiency in the competency area, and where the proficiency was developed.

Pigge reported the findings from both the teachers viewpoint and the principals viewpoint. Data show that teachers believed the most needed competency was the "ability to maintain order in a classroom." The median for this item on a five-point scale was 4.84--indicative of an "extensive need." The teachers, as a whole, felt they were approximately midway between "adequate" and "more than adequate" in applying skills of maintaining order in a classroom. Ranked second was the ability to motivate students.

Data related to where the teachers developed the proficiencies indicated that most respondents gave "work experience" credit for developing the need proficiencies to cope with the high need competencies. The teachers gave the university credit for developing proficiencies in less needed areas than in high need areas.

Data gathered from principals showed that principals thought that a positive attitude toward students and teachers was the most important need for teachers. This was followed by an ability to maintain control in the classroom. The principals felt that the ability to individualize instruction was the third most important need, and rated teachers fifth in this proficiency.

The following findings were presented by this study:

1. There was a high relationship between the teachers' need for a competency and their proficiencies within the competency areas.
2. Teachers' most needed competencies were in the areas of discipline, student motivation, and individualization of instruction.
3. Ability to individualize instruction was one instance where the teachers need for the competency was much higher than was their proficiency.
4. The proficiencies need to cope with high need competencies were mainly developed through work (teaching) experience.
5. As viewed by the principals, the following were listed as the three greatest need areas of teachers: (a) the ability to demonstrate a positive attitude toward students and teaching, (b) the ability to maintain control of classroom activities, and (c) ability to individualize instruction.¹

Some of these findings partially support those of Ingersoll who found that less experienced teachers desired more inservice training in techniques of individualizing instruction and classroom discipline than did more experienced teachers.²

Studies Related to the Concerns and Needs of Beginning Teachers

Recent attention has been focused on the induction phase of teaching--the first three years of inservice experience. Because of the importance of the first years, many

¹Fred L. Pigge, "Teacher Competencies: Need, Proficiency, and Where Proficiency was Developed," Journal of Teacher Education 29 (July/August 1978): 70-76.

²Ingersoll, "Assessing Inservice Training Needs Through Teacher Responses," pp. 169-173.

individual educators, professional organizations and state departments of education have pointed out the need for carefully planned induction programs for beginning teachers.

Fuller conducted a research study for the purpose of examining the developing concerns of small groups of prospective teachers and re-examining the findings of investigators in the hope of discovering what teachers are concerned about and whether their concerns can be conceptualized in some useful way. Specifically, this study involved recording and analyzing an extended series of freewheeling discussions which permitted student teachers to express themselves fully about their feelings and problems as they proceeded with student teaching.

The study utilized a total of twenty-five student teachers in group counseling sessions. A student-teaching supervisor agreed to substitute group-counseling sessions for the conventional weekly student-teaching seminar. One counseling psychologist met for two hours each week with student teachers during the student-teaching semester. The college supervisor was not present at any of these sessions. Student teachers were guaranteed confidentiality and were told they could discuss anything they wanted to talk about. All sessions were taped recorded, and typescripts were made of the recordings.

The same procedure was repeated the following semester with a second group of teachers, this time co-counseled by two counseling psychologists who checked one another to be

sure that opportunities for expression were not restricted. Each statement in the typescripts of these two groups was classified according to its main topic. A third group of seven student teachers was similarly counseled and taped recorded a third semester, but statements were not categorized.

The findings indicated that student teachers' concern with the new school situation and with discipline were the most frequently mentioned topics during early weeks. Concern with pupil development and pupil learning was more frequent during later weeks. This pattern characterized these student teachers as a combined group as well as each group separately.

On the one hand was concern with self, that is, concern with self-protection and self-adequacy: with class control, subject-matter adequacy, finding a place in the power structure of the school, and understanding expectations of supervisors, principal, and parents. On the other hand was concern with pupils: with their learning, their progress, and ways in which the teacher could implement this progress.

Student teachers were, during the first three weeks of the semester, concerned mostly with themselves. They continued to be self-centered during most of the semester, shifting to more concern with pupils toward the end of their student teaching.

This study provides important clues for supervisors as they plan orientation and inservice education programs for new teachers.¹

Fuller and Brown later refined the earlier conceptualization by Fuller, citing three states or concern clusters. The first stage is called the "survival classroom control", being liked by students, supervisors' opinions, about being observed, evaluated, praised and about the fear of failure. The second stage is called the "mastery stage" where there is much concern about teaching tasks. These concerns about limitations and frustrations of working with too many students, time pressures, lack of instructional materials and the like. The third stage is the stage of "concern for pupils." It is this stage where teachers are concerned about the social and emotional needs of students.²

Kennedy, Cruickshank and Myers studied the perceived problems of beginning secondary teachers grouped on the basis of school location. The study sought to describe and contrast inner-city, outer-city, suburban, and rural beginning secondary teachers with respect to both frequency of selected problems and the extent to which the problems were perceived as bothersome. The subjects were 400 recent

¹Frances Fuller and O. H. Brown, "Becoming a Teacher," in Teacher Education, Part II, The Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Study of Education, ed. Ryan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), pp. 25-52.

²Frances F. Fuller, "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization," American Education Research Journal 6 (March 1969): 207-225.

graduates of Ohio State University's College of Education from 1971 through 1973. The subjects were asked to complete an instrument entitled the Teacher Problems Checklist.

The TPCL consisted of 105 problem statements. Teachers were to indicate whether the problem occurred "frequently" or "infrequently."

The results suggested that certain kinds of classroom problems occur more frequently in inner-city schools. When specific classroom problems were grouped by factor analytic method into global problem areas and recently hired teachers in the four different settings were compared, inner-city teachers reported a significantly greater occurrence of problems relating to: (a) improving the life of students both inside and outside of school, (b) getting students to behave in accordance with teachers' wishes, and (c) acquiring greater freedom to perform as a professional. Inner-city teachers also reported greater frequency of problems concerning the stimulation of student interest in learning and school achievement. It was noted that while differences in problem frequency were found related to school location, significant differences in the degree to which problems were reported to be bothersome were not observed. Overall, the findings indicate that beginning inner-city teachers report a greater frequency of certain kinds of problems but, as a group, they are similar to their rural and suburban

colleagues as it relates to which problems personally disturb them.¹

Briscoe also studies the professional concerns of first year secondary teachers. The subject, teachers in selected Michigan public schools, were asked to examine fifty-one possible concerns and to note the degree to which each had been a concern at the beginning of the year and late in the year. Four of the five highest-ranked concerns reflected problems of classroom management/discipline or knowing students.²

Pataniezek studied the concerns of first-year secondary teachers who were graduates of a personalized experienced-based teacher education program. The subjects, all graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program at Michigan State University, were generally well satisfied with their teaching preparation and had an average of over 1,000 hours of experience with school-age youngsters prior to their first year of teaching. Consistent with earlier findings, survival concerns were identified by these subjects; as a group, initial concerns were high in the areas of gaining student respect, handling discipline problems, and maintaining order. However, of major interest in this study was the

¹Donald Cruickshank, John J. Kennedy and Betty Myers, "Problems of Beginning Teachers in Relation to School Location," Journal of Educational Research 69 (January 1976): 67-172.

²Frederick G. Briscoe, "The Professional Concerns of First Year Secondary Teachers in Selected Michigan Public Schools: A Pilot Study" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State, 1979), p. 172.

group's highest concern at the beginning of the year with having an impact on students. Other concerns ranked high by the group included concerns in the areas of knowing students as individuals, meeting individual needs, organizing classrooms, and concern for student learning.¹

Teacher educators share more than a passing interest in the ordeals shared by most beginning teachers. Emerging from many studies related to beginning teachers is the generalization that beginning teachers are first concerned with their own survival, then with issues relating to mastery of the teaching tasks, and then with impact on students. Such studies of teacher concerns are important in that they provide insights into what new teachers face as they proceed through the induction phase of teaching.

Pataniezek and Isaacson presented a conceptualization of the formal and informal processes of socializing the beginning secondary teacher and attempted to establish connections between this conception of socialization and the concerns of the beginning teachers. They described four phases or steps in the formal socialization process. They are described below.

Formal socialization into the teaching profession begins with preservice training programs. State certification and university requirements specify that an individual

¹ Dennis Pataniezek, "A Descriptive Study of Concerns of First Year Teachers who are Graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program at Michigan State University" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978).

must complete specific courses and practicum experiences which usually culminate in student teaching and application for certification. For the most part the institution's position is that it's responsibility for the individual ends with the granting of the certificate.

A second step in the formal induction process for most aspiring teachers is one or more job interviews, hopefully culminating in an offer of a teaching position. As a result of current job shortages, one consequence of the hiring process is that many teachers start their first job feeling unique, fortunate, and grateful to their employers for the opportunity to teach.

School district and building orientation programs provide the next step in the formal induction process. It is reported that some form of building or district orientation is provided for most first year teachers. Although teachers in several studies have reported some of the information presented in these sessions as necessary or helpful, almost none reported orientation procedures as valuable.¹ Most of the respondents were reported as being preoccupied with getting ready for students.

The last phase in the formal socialization process is thought to consist of the supervision of new teachers by administrators, carried out in several formal observations.

¹Nancy S. Issacson, "A Description of the Nature and Extent of Support Systems as Perceived by Beginning Secondary Teachers" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1978), p. 197.

Although the formal observation/supervision process continues to some extent throughout most teachers' careers, Fuchs maintains that the first formal observation operates as ritual to provide ceremonial transitions into the status of an accepted teacher.¹

Pataniezek and Isaacson discussed three informal socialization processes: the structure of preservice training, the influence of the organizational structure of schools, and the influence of colleagues.

These researchers found that teacher education graduates agree on several points related to preservice training. One point is that preservice training provides inadequate preparation for handling discipline problems; another, that education course work is too heavily weighted in theory and insufficient in practical application. Most secondary education graduates also report strong subject area preparation and claim that student teaching is the most valuable experience of the preservice program. The organization of schools aids in the physical and psychological isolation felt by new teachers.

Pataniezek and Isaacson suggest that the organizational structure of the secondary school also creates a task situation for neophytes which is no different from that of their experienced peers. When asked if beginning teachers

¹Estelle Fuchs, Teacher Talk: Views from Inside City Schools (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1967).

should be given special assistance of any kind, or whether assuming full responsibilities from the beginning is the most effective way to learn how to teach, nearly two-thirds of secondary teachers in one study advocated the immediate assumption of full responsibilities without special assistance.

Many studies point out that most beginning teachers tend to rely on a few select colleagues for support and assistance in the task of learning to teach. When teachers do report asking for assistance, it is when they are certain their competence will not be questioned or when they perceive no alternative for survival. Elements of one's personal or professional survival must be attended to before individuals can allow themselves the luxury of deeper collegial relationships. Research conducted by Patanizek and Isaacson led them to conclude that present socialization of the new teacher results in so many uncertainties that concern for one's survival is the logical result.¹

Literature related to concerns of beginning teachers suggests that in this phase of teaching the needs and concerns of the teachers may be quite different from those of older or more experienced teachers. There is evidence to suggest that the stages new teachers move through are predictable and that inservice training should be designed

¹Dennis Pataniezek and Nancy S. Isaacson, "The Relationship of Socialization and the Concerns of Beginning Secondary Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education 32 May/June 1981): 14-17.

with these stages in mind. There is further evidence which suggests that beginning teachers' needs are different based on the location of the school assignment.

Studies Related to Reading Assessment Instruments

Results of many research studies suggest that inservice programs in reading tend to be more satisfying both to participants and to presenters when they address current needs of the teachers in a particular school or area. The method used most often in determining the needs of teachers is that of administering a needs assessment instrument to the teachers involved.

Allen and Chester developed an assessment instrument for use with secondary reading teachers. It was designed to provide four types of information: descriptive information on present practices in the classroom, information on immediate needs and short-term goals, information for planning and evaluating longitudinal programs of reading inservice, and quantitative data which allow comparison with other schools. Since the instrument was designed for use by individual schools, very specific information was sought. Inservice activities could be planned on a school by school basis. The instrument contained three sections. Section one sought demographic information about the respondents' preferred types of inservice (e.g., lecture, teacher centers, supervisor from local reading resource personnel) and

preferred time for inservice (e.g., Saturdays, after school, released time).

Section two listed fourteen techniques and strategies and asked respondents to indicate their importance, how often they were practiced, and their priorities for help. Section three listed seven skill areas and asked the respondents to again indicate their importance, how frequently they were practiced and their priorities for reading inservice.

It was reported that the instrument was evaluated by a number of high school principals in British Columbia in terms of quality of directions and instruction, length, clarity, language and comprehensiveness. However, information related to actual use by classroom teachers was omitted. The instrument serves as a model of the type of information which can be obtained and used very easily by a department or school.¹

One of the variables of teacher effectiveness is a teacher's understanding of the subject that he or she teaches. Some evidence has been found to indicate that a relationship exists between what a teacher knows about his or her field and his or her success in teaching.² Yet, a search of the literature revealed that little research had been conducted

¹Sheilah M. Allen and Robert D. Chester, "A Needs Assessment Instrument for Secondary Reading Inservice," The Journal of Reading 21 (March 1978): 389-492.

²L. S. Vander Werf, How To Evaluate Teachers and Teaching (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958).

in the area of teacher knowledge and, particularly, teacher knowledge of reading.

One of the instruments used to measure a teacher's understanding of reading was constructed by Artley and Hardin in 1975. This instrument, The Inventory of Teacher Knowledge of Reading, was revised to include the following seven conceptual areas: (1) the reading act, (2) preparing for reading, (3) word identification, recognition, and perception, (4) comprehension and critical reading, (5) study skills and reading in the content areas, (6) development and (7) overcoming difficulties.

Analysis and validation of the revised instrument were conducted by Rorie in 1976. Content validity was established by seven reading specialists who reviewed, revised and re-reviewed the items.

The population for the validation study was 552 elementary education teachers in inservice workshops or graduate education courses and graduating college seniors.

After deletion of six items, item analysis of the remaining ninety-seven revealed item correlations with the total test scores ranging from .08 to .52. The mean, median, semi-interquartile range, standard deviation, and standard error or measurement were determined, and reliability of the instrument was computed using the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20.

The major findings of the study were as follows:

1. Using the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20, the internal-consistency reliability of the revised Inventory of Teacher Knowledge of Reading was found to be .920.
2. Thirty-five factors with values greater than 1 accounted for 61.051 percent of the total variance of the inventory.
3. The seven conceptual areas from which items for the inventory were drawn were not found to be identifiable or to stand apart as separate factors.

Rorie concluded that:

1. The inventory has sufficient validity and reliability to justify its use as a measure of teachers' knowledge of reading, such as in inservice or pre-service training.
2. A score indicating an individual's performance on the inventory should be interpreted as a global measure of knowledge or reading since the factor analysis indicated that it was impossible to identify discrete areas of teacher knowledge. Although the seven areas should not be interpreted as subtests of the inventory, when tailoring an inservice program for a given group of teachers, it would be legitimate to give attention to inventory items most frequently missed.¹

In light of the changing conditions in the field of reading education, a major concern of administrators and staff developers is that of how to inform effectively the staff of a school about new developments in the field of reading.

Robinson provides a model for staff development which gave special emphasis to the role of the classroom teachers in remediating problems of the reading program. The design

¹I. Laverne Rorie, "Analysis and Validation of the Revised Inventory of Teacher Knowledge of Reading," Journal of Reading 21 (April 1978): 606-607.

is divided into three areas: (1) establishing an atmosphere for staff development, (2) needs assessment, and (3) implementation of a staff development program in reading.

According to Robinson, the primary ingredient in the establishment of an appropriate atmosphere for staff development is viewed to be effective communication between persons involved. Robinson discusses some of the reasons that effective communication is difficult to achieve and listed a variety of means which may be useful in overcoming the problem. Among the suggestions offered are the following:

1. Both teachers and administrators should agree on the reasons for planning the staff development.
2. The individual classroom teacher must be recognized as being the most important aspect of a successful reading program.
3. Teachers must be willing to consider appropriate changes.

Robinson suggests, as do a number of authorities in the field of reading, that to improve teachers' reading skills, a very accurate needs' assessment must be completed using a school's current reading program for basic information. Two forms of instruments are suggested which may be used to collect information on the classroom teachers' perceptions of the current reading program in their schools. It was suggested that each form be completed anonymously, thereby encouraging complete freedom to express honest opinions and suggestions.

Form I was designed to collect informal information on various aspects of a school's total reading program with

particular emphasis on areas related to the teaching staff's background and their impressions of the overall quality of the reading instruction. Form I consists of nine questions which deal directly with the problems of recognizing, diagnosing and remediating the disabled reader.

Form II was designed to obtain information on individual teachers' perceptions of their own reading instructional practices. This form is useful not only in collecting data about current classroom reading efforts but also to note specific areas in reading education which the teachers feel are worthy of consideration when planning other staff development programs.

Robinson concludes that it is very important for teachers to be given the results of the needs assessment and should also be given the opportunity to interact and discuss with each other what they see as being important implications for their own staff development programs.¹

Studies Related to Supervision

The studies reviewed in this section are indicative of current practices in supervision and give clues to the problems to be resolved. Several of the studies focus on teachers' perceptions of roles and of services received.

¹Richard D. Robinson, "Staff Development and the Disabled Reader," Journal of Research and Development in Education 14 (March 1981): 74-79.

Claye conducted a study to find out the kinds of services desired by teachers and the extent to which such services are received. The study involved a survey of seventy-nine teachers enrolled in graduate school. Employees of the public schools in five different states were represented in the sample. They represented teachers of all grade levels in the elementary school and nine different subject matter areas in the secondary school. The definition of supervision was not limited to any given title to be used as a frame of reference by the subjects. Nineteen percent used the "direct supervisor", as a frame of reference. Twenty-eight percent used the "district supervisor", 45 percent used the "principal" and 7 percent used the "dean" and "department head."

The questionnaire used in this study was divided into six categories: (1) Teacher Growth Activities, (2) Teacher Participation Activities, (3) Supervisor's Professional Competency, (4) Supervisor's Activities, (5) Supervisor's Personal Qualities, and (6) Human Relations Activities.

A comparison of the percentage of subjects desiring and receiving the listed supervisory responsibilities showed that: (1) fifty-six percent of the subjects desired the services frequently while 30 percent received them frequently, (2) thirty-six percent received them occasionally, and (3) eight percent of the subjects did not desire the services at all while 27 percent did not receive them at all. The main finding was that there was no significant difference

between what teachers want and what they get from supervisors. The findings further revealed that when the differences in the proportion of subjects desiring and receiving the services were compared on the basis of the title of the person used as a frame of reference, the difference found for the special and district supervisors were not significant, but were in the case of the principal. There was no significant difference found of subjects desiring the supervisory responsibilities and the length of time subjects had been in service.¹

Blumbers attempted to investigate the following two major questions in this study of supervisory behavior: (1) Are perceptions that teachers have of the behavioral styles of their supervisors related to the quality of the interpersonal relations that teachers see existing between themselves and their supervisors, and (2) Do differential descriptions of behavioral styles produce different perceptions of the interpersonal relationships?

The subjects for the study were 210 inservice teachers registered in graduate courses in the College of Education at Temple University. The following four supervisory styles of behavior in the teacher-supervisor conference were identified for use in this study: (1) high in both direct and indirect behaviors; (2) high in use of direct behaviors,

¹Clifton M. Claye, "Lola Gets What Lola Wants from Supervision," The Journal of Educational Research 56 (March 1963): 358-361.

but low in use of indirect behaviors; (3) low in use of direct behaviors, but high in use on indirect behavior; and (4) low in both--not much use of either; relatively passive.

The Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor-Teacher Interaction Scale and the Relationship Inventory were used to obtain a measure of interpersonal relations. Each subject was asked to complete the instruments at weekly intervals, with the Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor-Teacher Interaction instrument being given first. When these were all completed and returned, the Relationship Inventory was administered. The time lag was introduced to minimize any halo effect that might be present.

The results of the study showed that positive evaluations by teachers of their supervisory interpersonal relationships seemed to develop (a) when a teacher perceived his supervisor's behavior as consisting of a heavy emphasis not only on telling, suggesting, and criticizing but also on reflecting and asking for information and opinions (high-direct, high-indirect); and (b) when a teacher perceived his supervisor as putting little emphasis on the telling dimension and much on the asking-reflecting dimension (low-direct, high-direct).

Generally less positive or even negative evaluations by teachers of their supervisory interpersonal relationships seemed to develop (a) when a teacher perceived his supervisor as predominantly emphasizing the telling dimensions and not doing much in the way of asking or reflecting

(high-direct, low-indirect); and (b) when a teacher perceived his supervisor's behavioral stance as relatively passive (low-direct, low-indirect).¹

Research was conducted by Cardenas for the purpose of providing more concrete evidence concerning disparity of viewpoints on the role of the supervisor and the tasks that a supervisor should perform as well as the manner of performing them.

The study was conducted with three groups of school personnel: supervisors, administrators, and teachers. Responses were obtained from forty-nine supervisors, sixty-five administrators, and 232 teachers in the San Antonio, Texas area. A variety of factors were analyzed to seek specific situations that might contribute to the lack of consensus. Consensus, or lack of it, was related to a number of variables, including the amount of supervisor preparation, years of supervisory experience, wealth of school district employing the supervisor, amount of teaching experience, grade level taught, subject taught, amount of teacher preparation, extent to which the teacher had been exposed to supervision, and quality of supervision experienced.

An instrument was developed to elicit responses to problem situations in supervision described in a series of short vignettes. The instrument contained eight such

¹Arthur Blumberg, "Supervisory Behavior and Interpersonal Relations," Educational Administration Quarterly 4 (Spring 1968): 34-45.

vignettes, each one dealing with a common problem situation. Specific action responses were selected by each respondent. Each of the vignettes was followed by five definite actions that a supervisor could perform, and it was up to the respondent to arrange the five actions in rank order according to preference.

The actions listed for each vignette were related to four different tasks of supervision. In arranging the choices in order of importance, the respondent indicated the relative importance of each task. The fifth choice in each vignette represented the orientation toward change. In this way the respondent also indicated his preference for either dynamic or tractive approaches to problems.

The researcher reports that none of the three groups studied showed significant overall disagreement on role expectations for the supervisor. Comparisons of the ranked values of the four tasks indicated a slight tendency for each of the three groups of school personnel to be more in agreement as to what are not, than in agreement as to what are, the important tasks of the supervisor. Each of the three groups favored dynamic, method-centered directive, and goal-oriented supervision. The three groups did not differ significantly in expected orientation, although administrators indicated less of a preference for a goal-oriented over pressure-responsive supervision than the other two groups.¹

¹Jose A. Cardenas, "Role Expectation for Instructional Supervisors as Expressed by Selected Supervisors, Administrators and Teachers" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1966).

The studies related to supervision point out that there is little agreement on what supervisors do or what they should do. There is some evidence available to suggest that services performed by supervisors are needed and desired by a large percentage of teachers.

A study designed to examine the behavior of supervisors in interviews with teachers was conducted by Blumberg. The main focus of the study was on the pattern of verbalization of the supervisor. Recordings were made of fifty supervisory interviews or conferences using real supervisors, with graduate students sitting in as teacher subjects. The recordings were analyzed using an interaction system with indirect and direct supervisory behavior contrasted.

Analysis of the interviews revealed that the supervisor's style was basically directive. They spent 45 percent of the time talking. Their talk was 63 percent directive in style. They used "telling" acts four times more frequently than "asking." They told teachers about alternatives seven times as often as they asked about them.

This study, supervisors verbalized very little encouragement. Praise was rarely expressed in extended comments. Instead it tended to be in single words or short phrases like "good", "fine", and so forth.¹ This study

¹Arthur Blumberg, "Supervisor-Teacher Relationships: A Look at the Supervisory Congruence," Administrator's Notebook 19 (September 1970): 175-177.

suggests that supervisors, like teachers, rarely analyze their own behavior, and are unaware of some of these problems. Supervisors need to possess the skills needed to stimulate emotional growth and promote interpersonal relations.

Summary of Related Literature

The review of related literature focused upon (1) teachers' perceptions of instructional needs and competencies, (2) special concerns of the beginning teacher, (3) reading assessment instruments, and (4) supervisory behavior.

The literature relating to teachers' perceived needs reflects key points which are common to most studies. The study conducted by Smith and Otto, which examined the training needs of pre-service and inservice teachers, was among those which lend support to the idea that the use of perceived teacher problems is an element which must be included in teacher growth programs. This study, as well as, studies conducted by Ingersoll and Schneider, revealed differences among teachers in perceived needs within selected skill areas, grade levels and length of service.

A study conducted by Pigge, which was aimed at identifying competencies needed in teaching, determining proficiency in these competencies and where teachers received the greatest help in developing the competencies, revealed that the most needed competency was the ability to

maintain order in the classroom. Ranked second was the ability to motivate students.

Respondents believed that "work experience" was the best method of developing the proficiencies. There was no agreement among principals and teachers as to the greatest needs areas.

Other needs expressed by teachers in the various studies were:

1. providing for the disabled reader
2. providing for the superior reader
3. individualized instruction
4. developing pupils' "selves"
5. motivating students
6. student centered concerns
7. control of students

Adams focused attention on the needs of elementary classroom teachers in the teaching of reading. Many of the needs reported in this study were similar to those listed above. However, other areas of need found were as follows:

1. Understanding the breadth of the reading program, enjoyment of reading, creative writing and instruction in reading in the content fields;
2. Providing opportunities for children to learn and to use the various reading skills;
3. Understanding values and uses of a wide range of materials and resources; and
4. Understanding the nature and techniques of evaluation and the distinction between evaluation and testing.

Adam highlighted the need for a follow-up study in which the needs of teachers as revealed by questionnaire are checked against needs as revealed by classroom performance. Support for this recommendation was found in a study completed by Jones and Hayes. These researchers indicated that self-perception measures should not be used alone to determine the make-up of staff development programs but must be used in conjunction with other measures.

Several studies have been conducted aimed at determining the attitude and ability of content area teachers to teach reading and the amount of reading being taught by content teachers at the high school level. After replicating a survey which was originally conducted in 1964, Braam and Walker concluded that subject area teachers were more aware of students' deficiencies than strengths and were unaware of the majority of reading skills needed by students to read successfully in the various disciplines.

Findings of a study completed by Jackson some years later did not support the conclusions of Braam and Walker. Results of the data in Jackson's study showed that a majority of the teachers in most content areas were emphasizing reading skills in their teaching. Jackson concluded that secondary teachers have now accepted the responsibility of teaching reading and understand that students can benefit from instruction in reading.

Literature related to this study was presented in the following four areas: instructional needs and competencies of classroom teachers, (2) needs of beginning teachers, (3) needs assessment instruments, and (4) supervision of teachers. There is evidence to suggest that researchers have focused ample attention on the identification of needs of classroom teachers. However, more attention appears to have been focused on the needs of elementary teachers than on the needs of teachers at other grade levels. Most of the studies concerned with the identification of reading needs or general instructional needs of teachers sought the perceptions of the teachers through the use of a survey or questionnaire. Although findings of studies by Ingersoll, Otto and Smith, Cruickshank, Pigge and others revealed that needs differed according to grade level and teaching experience, concerns by teachers in general, included individualized instruction, motivating students and discipline. Another common thread found among the studies reviewed was the suggestion by researchers that perceptions of teachers should be sought and utilized but that more than teacher responses must be included in the inservice training process.

Researchers have substantially investigated the experiences and concerns of neophyte teachers. Studies by Fuller and Brown, Briscoe, Patanizek and others have revealed that beginning teachers move through three stages or concern

clusters. They are first concerned about self, later about their tasks and finally about their impact on students. Studies aimed at determining specific concerns of first year teachers reflected problems of classroom management, discipline and knowing students. From the research, there is ample evidence that staff development activities designed to address the concerns of beginning teachers would be most beneficial.

The method most often used in determining the needs of teachers is the needs assessment survey. A comprehensive needs assessment process is recommended by a number of authorities in the field of reading since the true needs of teachers are often hidden or are not recognized. Allen and Chester are among those who have offered suggestions for construction and samples of needs assessment instruments. They recommended that the survey include a section of background information, choice of subjects or topics and a section on the respondent's preferences for types of staff development activities. The needs assessment process must also include ways to balance the needs perceived by the teachers and those perceived by the administrators.

The literature related to supervision points out the need for additional research related to supervision and the role and activities of instructional supervisors. Studies reviewed in this area are indicative of current practice and give clues as to problems to be resolved. The study conducted by Cardenas on the role and tasks performed by

supervisors indicated that the school personnel involved in the study were more in agreement as to what are not, than in agreement as to what are, the more important tasks of the supervisor.

Blumberg conducted a study which revealed that supervisors exhibited some of the same behavior which they discouraged on the part of teachers. In this study, which examined the behavior of supervisors in interviews with teachers, the supervisors did more talking than did the teachers, verbalized little encouragement and told teachers about alternatives far more frequently than they asked them. This study suggests that supervisors, like teachers, rarely analyze their own behavior, and are unaware of some of these problems.

Claye's study, which was aimed at finding out the kind of services desired by teachers and the extent to which they received such services, revealed that a large percent of neophyte and mature teachers desired and received supervisory services. The researcher suggested that the idea that older teachers no longer desire services of supervisors is not valid.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND RESEARCH

Design of the Study

In this chapter the researcher discusses the research design, describes the subjects in the sample, provides a description of the questionnaire, discusses the procedures used to conduct this study and collect the data, and gives a description of the statistical technique used to analyze the data.

Research Design

The research design used in this study was correlational, a form of the descriptive methodology. More precisely, the correlational design involved a one-time administration of a questionnaire for the collection of sets of ratings from the sample of subjects and the determination of the relationship between those sets of ratings.

The sets of ratings were derived from the teachers' assessment of need and help provided to them in four aspects of the teaching of language arts/reading.

The purpose of the design was exploratory, concerned with determining the correlation between predictor and

criterion variables. Predictor variables were the teachers' level of competence and services provided to teachers. The criterion variables were teaching position, teaching experience, courses completed in reading, and educational level.

Locale

This study was conducted in schools located in Area II of the Atlanta Public School System, Atlanta, Georgia. Area II is one of three administrative areas comprising the Atlanta Public School System. The twenty-seven elementary schools, three middle schools, nine high schools and one alternative school in Area II were located in the southeast and southwest sections of the city. The income levels for families in these sections of the city spanned from low middle to low. The area is administered by an area superintendent and an assistant area superintendent. Fifteen resource teachers and eight psychologists provide assistance to students, teachers, and principals in all of the schools. Six resource teachers are assigned as generalists to provide services to the twenty-seven elementary schools, while nine resource teachers provide services in specific subject areas to the twelve middle and high schools. Six resource teachers with special training and expertise in language arts were assigned as generalists to provide assistance to elementary teachers in the four core subject areas of language arts, science, mathematics and social studies. However, because of the focus of the school system over the last five years,

the areas of language arts and math have received more attention. During the 1983-84 school year, Area II elementary schools were staffed with approximately 620 teachers who worked with about 12,179 students from grades kindergarten through fifth or kindergarten through seventh.

Nine resource teachers provided specialized services to middle and high school teachers in the areas of English/reading, mathematics, social studies, art, physical education, science, music and vocational education. The three middle schools in Area II during the 1983-84 school year had 162 teachers and a student population for grades six through eight of 2,908. High schools during this same period had a student population of approximately 8,037 and a total teaching staff of 497.

The forty schools in Area II qualified for services under the Chapter I, ECIA Program. This program provides additional teachers and aides to work with students who are performing below grade level in reading and mathematics.

The Atlanta Public Schools' Skills Continua identify the reading and related language skills as well as associated thinking and study skills that need to be sequentially developed from kindergarten through high school.

At the elementary and middle school levels, the curriculum includes objectives with correlated skills from the Continua and a model for integrating reading instruction with speaking, listening and composition. At the secondary level, students are offered a Language Arts Curriculum

sequence based upon reading performance levels. At the primary and intermediate levels, a basal reader approach is used.

In addition to the support services provided to teachers by area resource teachers, support services are also provided by central office personnel and personnel of the reading/mathematics center. Elementary, middle and high school reading and content area teachers are provided support services from several different divisions of the school system. Area and central office personnel work together to identify the needs of teachers and to plan and conduct appropriate workshops and inservice sessions. Teachers are also released from the classroom for intensive instruction in reading methods and materials conducted by the reading/mathematics center.

Sample of the Study

The population for this study included regular classroom and compensatory teachers of language arts/reading in schools located in Area II of Atlanta Public Schools. Area II was selected because it was assessible to the researcher. A total of forty schools made up this administrative area.

Teachers from a sample of thirty-six schools were involved in the study. These included twenty-six elementary schools, two middle schools and eight high schools. The teachers from three schools were excluded because these

teachers participated in the pilot study to validate the instrument. Teachers of schools involved in the pilot study were typical of those in the sample.

One questionnaire was sent to each regular classroom and compensatory teacher of language arts/reading in each school. A total of 527 questionnaires were mailed to the thirty-six schools.

Shown in table 1 is the percentage of returned questionnaires. The response rate was 67 percent based on the 347 usable questionnaires.

TABLE 1
PERCENTAGE OF RETURN OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Group	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number Returning Questionnaire	Percentage Returned
Elementary Teachers	410	246	60%
Middle School Teachers	38	33	87%
High School Teachers	79	57	72%
Totals	527	347	67%

Instrument Used to Collect the Data

Instrument Construction. The questionnaire used in this study to obtain data from classroom teachers was designed by the writer. The procedures used to design the instrument

were as follows: Categories of teaching skills were abstracted from publications relating to teacher competencies from the State Department of Georgia, observation checklists designed by resource teachers, discussions with resource teachers, classroom teachers and principals, as well as from instruments designed for this purpose found in the literature. From these sources a series of items describing a variety of teaching skills were selected for use in section I of the instrument. A list of services provided by resource teachers to the school was compiled. The items were generated basically from the job descriptions for resource teachers in Atlanta Public Schools, discussions with resource teachers, classroom teachers and principals, and from the knowledge which the writer gained from five years of experience as a teacher and ten years of experience as a resource teacher.

Both the needs assessment section and the resource teacher services section of the instrument were distributed to a group of resource teachers and classroom teachers for the assessment of item appropriateness and clarity. The instrument was modified based on the ideas and suggestions of the groups. Following modifications recommended by these two groups, the instrument was further scrutinized by two resource teachers and the researcher for further modification and/or deletion of items.

The instrument was field tested by administering it to three selected groups of teachers--an elementary group of

teachers, a middle school group of teachers and a high school group of teachers who were not a part of the sample.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts: Part I elicited information concerning the respondents' present teaching assignment, education level and years of experience. Part II was composed of two sections. Sub-section I comprised the requested information regarding teachers need and sub-section II elicited opinions regarding the extent of resource teacher services.

The questionnaire, using a Likert-type scale, was distributed to selected teachers. They were asked to indicate areas of need and to indicate resource teacher services received. The data from the completed questionnaires were compiled and reviewed by the researcher. Items on final questionnaire were revised in accordance with suggestions and feedback obtained from the field test.

Feasibility Study. A group of five resource teachers participated in refining the instrument used in this study. Following modification, addition and/or deletion of some items by this group of resource teachers, the list was further scrutinized by two resource teachers and the researcher for further modification, addition and deletion of items. In the opinion of the researcher and the resource teachers involved, the instrument contained only those items which were associated with the teaching of reading across the three instructional levels--elementary, middle,

high--and were descriptive of services provided by language arts resource teachers.

For the pilot sample, three schools participated in the validation of the instrument. A group of eleven elementary teachers, six middle school teachers and nine high school teachers participated in this phase of the study. The questionnaire was administered to each group of teachers by the researcher. After completing the questionnaire, each teacher was asked to respond to a list of prepared questions regarding the questionnaire (see appendix). The questions related to clarity of items, directions, length of instrument, size of print and other aspects of the questionnaire. Responses were received and used by the researcher and incorporated into the final edition of the instrument.

The feedback was similar from each group of teachers and focused mainly on the length of the instrument and the directions. As a result of the feasibility study, the final edition of the questionnaire was shortened and directions were changed in accordance with the teachers' suggestions.

Procedures for Implementing Study

Approval to administer the questionnaire in the selected schools was obtained from the Review Committee. A letter explaining the purpose of the study and requesting participation was mailed to principals of the thirty-six selected schools. The principals' cooperation in distributing the questionnaire to teachers was requested.

The questionnaires for teachers were sent through school mail to the work sites. The package of questionnaires was sent to the attention of the principal with accompanying letters to teachers explaining the purpose and requesting their participation. The letters assured respondents of confidentiality--that all data would be reported in group format with no attempt to identify school or individual respondents.

Follow-up telephone calls were made to principals and a follow-up letter was mailed to teachers who had not returned completed questionnaires.

Data from the completed questionnaires were compiled and analyzed.

Analysis of Data

The data were collected and analyzed in the following manner: All of the data were collected from language arts/reading teachers in Area II, one of three administrative areas which make up the Atlanta Public School System.

A two-part questionnaire was used to collect data for this study. Part I sought demographic information only. Forty-three statements or teaching skills were selected to form part II, section one for the purpose of assessing teacher needs. These skills were restated as serviced provided by resource teachers to form part II, section two of the questionnaire. Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to indicate on a five point Likert-type scale how

competent they felt in specific skill areas and the amount of help which had been provided to them by language arts resource teachers. Response choices given for part II section one were:

- 05 - Mastery
- 04 - Above average competency
- 03 - Adequate competency
- 02 - Limited competency
- 01 - No competency

Response choices given for part II, section two were:

- 05 - Extensive help provided
- 04 - Much help provided
- 03 - Adequate help provided
- 02 - Limited help provided
- 01 - No help provided

The responses of "Mastery" and "Extensive Help Provided" were weighted with the value of 5.00. The responses of "No Competency" and "No Help Provided" were weighted 1.00.

The forty-three teaching skills which formed the basis of both sections of part II are shown in the appendix.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

The statistical data derived from the responses to the "Teacher Needs and Resource Teacher Services Questionnaire" used in this research were assembled, organized, and analyzed at a computer center in the locale of this study using the Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation and chi-square. The results were expressed in terms of frequencies and percent. A frequency distribution was obtained by categories--elementary teachers, middle school teachers and high school teachers--to show a

description of respondents by educational levels, years of teaching experience and number of courses completed in language arts/reading.

The Pearson Product Moment Coefficient Correlation, which assesses the strength of a linear relationship between two sets of sample scores in interval form, was used to determine the statistical significance of the associations correlation coefficient obtained in hypotheses two, three four, six, seven, eight, ten, eleven, twelve and thirteen. If statistically significant relationships were found at the .05 level, the null hypotheses were rejected.

For hypotheses one and five chi square, a non-parametric test that determines whether two frequency distributions are associated at the .05 level was used. The degrees of freedom were also computed. These values indicated the measures obtained and showed how elementary, middle and high school teachers were associated or independent in their responses.

Summary

This chapter described the research design, the locality in which the study was conducted, the sample, the development of the instrument used, the data-gathering procedures and the statistical treatment.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

This chapter of the thesis contains findings and analyses of data accruing from the eighty-six response items of the Teacher Needs and Resource Teacher Services Questionnaire which encompassed four aspects of the teaching of reading: assessment, classroom management, skill development and techniques and strategies and the extent of services provided in the same areas by resource teachers.

The collected data were statistically treated and analyzed using chi-square with the .05 level of significance serving as the decision rule for hypothesis testing.

In this section a data analysis is presented of the perceptions of teachers regarding instructional needs and services.

Question 1: Is there a relationship between teachers' level of competence and their position, educational training, teaching experience and/or the number of courses completed in language arts/reading?

Hypotheses one, two, three and four were formulated to assess the relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence with their present position, educational training, teaching experience and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading. Chi-square was applied to determine either the degree of association or independence between the factors in hypothesis one.

Teaching Position and Competence in Assessment

- 1 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and their present position.

The results of the data analysis for null hypothesis one are shown in tables 2, 3, 4, and 5.

TABLE 2

TEACHING POSITION AND COMPETENCE IN ASSESSMENT

Group	Level of Competence						Chi-Square	
	1.0 - 3.0		3.1 - 4.0		4.1 - 5.0			
	No Comp.		Adequate		Above Average			
	to		to		to			
	Adequate		Above Average		Mastery			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	df	
<hr/>								
Elem. School Teacher N = 246	66	26.8	106	43.1	74	30.1		
Middle School Teacher N = 33	11	33.3	13	39.4	9	27.3	4	4.818
High School Teacher N = 57	10	17.5	23	40.4	24	42.1		
Totals	87	25.9	142	42.3	107	31.8		

Table 2 shows the relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence in assessment and their present position. The majority of the elementary and middle school teachers in the sample rated themselves in the area of assessment as adequate to above average or above average to mastery (73.2 percent, 66.7 percent respectively), while the high school teachers rated themselves above average to mastery (82.5 percent). When the competency ratings of the group as a whole were correlated with their present positions, the obtained chi-square (4.818) did not reach the required table value (9.488 with four degrees of freedom) to be significant at the .05 level. Therefore, this part of null hypothesis one was accepted and it was concluded that there was no statistically significant relationship between the present position of teachers and their perceived level of competence in assessment. The investigator noted that only 25.9 percent of all teachers considered perceived themselves as having adequate to no competence in the area of assessment.

Teaching Position and Competence in Classroom Management

The results of the analysis concerning teaching position and competence in classroom management are presented in table 3.

TABLE 3

TEACHING POSITION AND COMPETENCE IN
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Group	Level of Competence						df	Chi-Square
	1.0 - 3.0 No Comp. to Adequate f %	3.1 - 4.0 Adequate to Above Average f %	4.1 - 5.0 Above Average to Mastery f %					
Elem. School Teacher N = 246	30 20.3	117 47.6	7 32.1					
Middle School Teacher N = 33	8 24.2	12 36.4	13 39.4			4	1.8635	
High School Teacher N = 57	12 21.1	24 42.1	21 36.8					
Totals	70 20.8	153 45.5	113 33.6					

Presented in table 3 are the data relative to the relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence in classroom management and their present position. The majority of the elementary and high school teachers in the sample rated themselves as having adequate to above average and above average competence respectively. The majority of middle school teachers rated themselves as above average to mastery (75.8 percent) in this competency area. When all of the ratings in classroom management were correlated with the teachers' present positions, the obtained chi-square (1.864) did not reach the necessary table value (9.488 with four degrees of freedom) to be significant at the .05 level. This part of null hypothesis one was accepted. There was no

statistically significant relationship between the present position of teachers and their perceived level of competence in classroom management. The data showed that only 70 or 20.8 percent of the teachers perceived themselves as needing help in the area of classroom management.

Teaching Position and Competence in Skill Development

Shown in table 4 are the results of the data analysis concerning teaching position and competence in the area of skill development.

TABLE 4
TEACHING POSITION AND COMPETENCE IN
SKILL DEVELOPMENT

Group	<u>Level of Competence</u>						df	Chi-Square
	1.0 - 3.0		3.1 - 4.0		4.1 - 5.0			
	No Comp. to Adequate f	%	Adequate to Above Average f	%	Above Average to Mastery f	%		
Elem. School Teacher N = 246	52	21.1	134	54.5	60	24.4		
Middle School Teacher N = 33	7	21.2	17	51.5	9	27.3	4	5.509
High School Teacher N = 57	6	10.5	30	52.6	21	36.8		
Totals	65	19.3	181	53.9	90	26.8		

The data in table 4 show the number and percent of responses related to teaching position and competence in skill development. The largest group of teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school level (78.9 percent, 78.8 percent and 88.4 percent respectively) rated themselves as having more than adequate to mastery competence in skill development. The correlation of teachers' present positions with their ratings in skill development resulted in a chi-square of 5.509. This did not reach the necessary table value (9.488 with four degrees of freedom) to be significant at the .05 level. Therefore, this part of null hypothesis one was accepted, verifying the statement that there was no statistically significant correlation between the distribution of the responses of the three groups. These data indicated that approximately 80 percent of the teachers perceived themselves as not needing assistance in the area of skill development while 19.3 percent perceived themselves as needing assistance in this aspect of reading.

Teaching Position and Competence in Techniques and Strategies

The analysis of the data related to teaching position and competence in techniques and strategies is presented in table 5.

TABLE 5
TEACHING POSITION AND COMPETENCE
IN TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

Group	<u>Level of Competence</u>						df	Chi-Square
	1.0 - 3.0 No Comp. to Adequate f %	3.1 - 4.0 Adequate to Above Average f %	4.1 - 5.0 Above Average to Mastery f %					
Elem. School Teacher N = 246	39 24.0	128 52.0	59 24.0					
Middle School Teacher N = 33	10 30.3	16 48.5	7 21.2			4	1.6245	
High School Teacher N = 57	11 19.3	30 56.6	16 28.1					
Totals	80 23.8	174 51.8	82 24.4					

Table 5 shows the relationship between teachers' level of competence in techniques and strategies and their present position. The majority of elementary, middle and high school language teachers in the sample, rated themselves as more than adequate to above average (76 percent, 69.7 percent, and 80 percent respectively). When the competency ratings of the group as a whole were correlated with their present position, the obtained chi-square (1.624) did not reach the necessary table value (9.488 with four degrees of freedom) to be significant at the .05 level. This part of null

hypothesis one was accepted supporting the statement that there was no statistically significant relationship between the present position of teachers and their perceived level of competence in techniques and strategies.

Educational Level and Competence in
Assessment, Classroom Management,
Skill Development and Techniques
and Strategies

2 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and their level of educational training.

The comparison made between the responses of teachers at various educational levels and the four competency areas is reported in table 6.

TABLE 6
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND THE FOUR
COMPETENCY AREAS

Criterion Variable	Assessment			Classroom Management			Skill Development			Techniques and Strategies		
	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r
Educational Level N = 3.36 Mean = 1.64 SD = .58	3.74	.72	.21	3.80	.70	.23	3.84	.66	.21	3.69	.69	.18***

*** $p < .001$

Table 6 shows a comparison of teachers' educational levels with their ratings in assessment, classroom management, skill development and techniques and strategies. When the

educational level was compared with the ratings in the areas of assessment, classroom management and skill development, there was no significant relationships found. The means were 3.74, 3.80 and 3.84 respectively. The standard deviation ranged from .66 to .72. When the educational level was compared with the ratings in the area of techniques and strategies, a highly significant relationship was found. The mean for this sub-area was 3.60. The correlation coefficient was significant at the .001 level. While the correlation coefficient was highly significant, its power of prediction was limited. When the educational levels of the group as a whole were compared, a mean of 1.64 was obtained.

The data related to educational levels of teachers indicated that 40.2 percent of the teachers held a bachelors degree, 54.8 percent held a master's degree, 4.2 percent held a specialist degree, and only 0.3 percent held the doctorate degree. This part of null hypothesis two which related to area of techniques and strategies was rejected while the part for null hypothesis two which related to the areas of assessment, classroom management and skill development was accepted.

Teaching Experience and Competence in
Assessment, Classroom Management,
Skill Development and
Techniques and
Strategies

- 3 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and their years of experience.

TABLE 7

TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND THE FOUR
COMPETENCY AREAS

Criterion Variable	Assessment			Classroom Management			Skill Development			Techniques and Strategies		
	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r
Teaching Experience	3.74	.72	.09*	.380	.70	.05	3.84	.66	.07	3.69	.69	.11*
N = 336												
Mean = 3.46												
SD = 1.24												

*p < .05

The third hypothesis was concerned with whether there was a relationship between teachers' years of experience and their ratings in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development and techniques and strategies. When the teaching experiences were compared with teacher ratings in the areas of classroom management and skill development, there were no significant correlation found. The mean for such of the areas was similar (3.80 for classroom management and 3.84 for skill development). When teaching experience was compared with teacher ratings in the areas of assessment and techniques and strategies the mean was 3.74 and 3.69 respectively. The correlation coefficients for both of these areas were significant at the .05 level.

While the coefficients for assessment and techniques and strategies were significant, the power of predictability

was limited based on Guilford's suggested interpretations for values of r . Therefore, the part of null hypothesis three which related to classroom management and skill development was not rejected. The data showed that more than half of the teachers in the sample had 16 or more years of experience (29.3 percent indicated 16-20 years, 24.9 percent indicated 20 years or more). Only 5.7 percent of the teachers indicated that they had less than six years of experience.

Number of Courses Completed in Language Arts/
Reading and Competence in Assessment,
Classroom Management, Skill
Development, and Techniques
And Strategies

- 4 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading.

The results of the data analysis for null hypothesis four are shown in table 8.

TABLE 8
COURSES COMPLETED IN LANGUAGE ARTS AND
THE FOUR COMPETENCY AREAS

Criterion Variable	Assessment			Classroom Management			Skill Development			Techniques and Strategies		
	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r
Number of Courses N = 336 Mean = 3.21 SD = 1.24	3.74	.72	.20	3.80	.70	.20	3.64	.66	.7***	3.69	.69	.20

*** $p < .001$

Table 8 shows the relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development, techniques and strategies and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading. The means for assessment, classroom management and techniques and strategies, (3.74, 3.80, and 3.69 respectively) were not found to be significantly different. However, the mean for the area of skill development was significant at the .001 level. When the competency ratings were compared with the number of courses completed in language/arts reading of the group as a whole, a mean of 3.80 was obtained. The majority of teachers had completed three or more courses in language arts/reading. Null hypothesis four was rejected in the area of skill development, but was accepted in the areas of assessment, classroom management and techniques and strategies.

In summary, the data related to question one revealed that a significant relationship was found between the perceived level of competence in the area of techniques and strategies and teachers' educational training; between the perceived level of competence in assessment and techniques and strategies and teachers' experience and between the perceived level of competence in skill development and the courses completed in language arts/reading.

Question 2: Is there a relationship between the amount of service provided by resource teachers and teachers'

present position, educational training, teaching experience and/or courses completed in reading?

Hypotheses 5, 6, 7, and 8 were formulated to determine the relationship between services provided by resource teachers as perceived by classroom teachers and the teachers present position, educational training, teaching experience and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading. Chi-square was applied to determine the degree of relationship between the factors. Where the correlation was significant, Cramer's V was applied.

Teaching Position and Services
Provided in Assessment

- 5 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of services provided by resource teachers and teachers' present position.

The results of the data analysis for null hypothesis five are shown in tables 9, 10, 11, and 12.

TABLE 9

TEACHING POSITION AND SERVICES
PROVIDED IN ASSESSMENT

Group	1.0 - 2.0 No Help to Limited Help		2.1 - 3.0 More Than Limited Help to Adequate Help		3.1 - 5.0 More Than Adequate Help to Extensive Help		Chi- df Square
	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Elem. School Teacher N = 243	46	18.9	119	49.0	78	32.1	

TABLE 9--Continued

Group	1.0 - 2.0 No Help to Limited Help		2.1 - 3.0 More Than Limited Help to Adequate Help		3.1 - 5.0 More Than Adequate Help to Extensive Help		Chi- df Square
	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Middle School Teacher N = 33	9	27.3	16	48.5	8	24.2	4 16.207**
High School Teacher N = 56	23	41.1	26	46.4	7	12.5	
Totals	78	23.5	161	48.5	93	28.0	

**p < .01

Table 9 shows the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of help provided by resource teachers in the area of assessment and their present position. More than two-thirds of the elementary teachers (81.1 percent) and middle school teachers (72.7 percent) indicated that resource teachers were providing adequate help to them in the area of assessment. While the majority of high school teachers also indicated that adequate help was being provided, slightly more than 40 percent (41.1 percent) indicated that only minimum help was provided. When the ratings in assessment of the group as a whole were correlated with teachers' present positions, the obtained chi-square value (16.207) exceeded the required table value (9.488 with four degrees of freedom) to be significant at the .01 level. Cramer's V, a test of

correlation for nominal data revealed a value of 0.156. There was a statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the services provided by resource teachers in the area of assessment and their present positions, although predictability was very limited. Therefore, this part of null hypothesis five was rejected. The investigator concluded that 76.5 percent of all the teachers were of the opinion that resource teachers had provided adequate to above adequate help in the areas of assessment.

Teaching Position and Services Provided in Classroom Management

The results of the analysis concerning teaching positions and services provided in classroom management are presented in table 10.

TABLE 10

TEACHING POSITION AND SERVICES PROVIDED IN CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Group	1.0 - 2.0 No Help to Limited Help		2.1 - 3.0 More Than Limited Help to Adequate Help		3.1 - 5.0 More Than Adequate Help to Extensive Help		df	Chi-Square
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Elem. School Teacher N = 243	46	18.9	119	49.0	78	32.1		
Middle School Teacher N = 33	7	21.2	20	60.6	6	18.2	4	12.108**
High School Teacher N = 56	20	35.7	27	48.2	9	16.1		
Totals	73	22.0	166	50.0	93	28.0		

**p < .01

Presented in table 10 are the data relative to the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of help provided by resource teachers in the area of classroom management and their present positions. Approximately 60-80 percent of teachers at all three levels indicated that resource teachers had provided adequate to extensive help in the area of classroom management. However, a larger percentage of middle school teachers (60.6 percent) rated resource teachers help as "adequate" than did elementary (49.0 percent) or high school teachers (48.2 percent). It is of some interest to note that 32.1 percent of the elementary teachers indicated that extensive help had been given in the area of classroom management, while 35.7 percent of the high school teachers indicated that only minimum help had been given. When the ratings for this group as a whole were correlated with their present positions, the obtained chi-square value (12.108) met the requirements (9.488 with four degrees of freedom) to reject the stated hypothesis at the .01 level for a two-tailed test. Cramer's V revealed a correlation of +.13.5 or +.14. Though data indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between the teachers' present positions and their perceptions of service provided by resource teachers, the obtained correlation suggested that the degree of predictability was very limited.

Teaching Position and Services Provided
in Skill Development

The data in table 11 reflect the results concerning teaching position and the services provided in skill development.

TABLE 11
TEACHING POSITION AND SERVICES PROVIDED
IN SKILL DEVELOPMENT

Group	1.0 - 2.0 No Help to Limited Help		2.1 - 3.0 More Than Limited Help to Adequate Help		3.1 - 5.0 More Than Adequate Help to Extensive Help		df	Chi-Square
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Elem. School Teacher N = 242	59	24.4	119	49.2	64	26.4		
Middle School Teacher N = 33	8	24.2	21	63.6	4	12.1	4	8.066
High School Teacher N =	21	37.5	25	44.6	10	17.9		
Totals	88	26.6	165	49.8	78	23.6		

Table 11 shows the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of help provided by resource teachers in the area of skill development and their present position. The majority of teachers at each of the three levels indicated that adequate to extensive help had been provided in the area of skill development (75.6, 75.7, 62.5 respectively). A higher percentage of high school teachers indicated that minimum help was provided (37.5 percent) and

fewer teachers at this level reported that above average help had been provided than did elementary or middle school teachers. Correlating the overall ratings in skill development with teachers' present position, the obtained chi-square (8.066) did not reach the required table value to be significant. There was no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the services provided by resource teachers in the area of skill development and their present positions. Therefore, this part of null hypothesis five was accepted. These data indicated that more than 73 percent of the teachers held the perception that resource teachers were providing services as needed in the area of skill development while more than 26 percent indicated that adequate help had not been provided in this area.

Teaching Position and Services Provided in Techniques and Strategies

Shown in table 12 are the results of the data analysis concerning services provided in techniques and strategies and teaching position.

TABLE 12

TEACHING POSITION AND SERVICES PROVIDED IN TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

Group	1.0 - 2.0		2.1 - 3.0		3.1 - 5.0		df	Square
	No Help to Limited Help f	%	More Than Limited Help to Adequate Help f	%	More Than Adequate Help to Extensive Help f	%		
Elem. School Teacher N = 238	59	24.8	117	49.2	62	26.1		

TABLE 12--Continued

Group	1.0 - 2.0 No Help to Limited Help		2.1 - 3.0 More Than Limited Help to Adequate Help		3.1 - 5.0 More Than Adequate Help to Extensive Help		Chi- df Square
	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Middle School Teacher N = 31	10	32.3	18	58.1	3	9.7	4 13.343**
High School Teacher N = 56	24	43.6	25	45.5	6	10.9	
Totals	93	28.7	160	49.4	71	21.9	

**p < .01 level

Presented in table 12 are the data relative to the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of help provided by resource teachers in the area of techniques and strategies and their present position. The majority of teachers in the sample (71.3 percent) indicated that adequate to extensive help had been provided in the area of techniques and strategies. A higher percentage of teachers at the middle and high school levels indicated that minimum help had been provided in this area (32.3 and 43.6 respectively) than did teachers at the elementary level. Consistent with ratings in other aspects of reading, a larger percentage of high school teachers were of the opinion that only minimum help had been provided when compared with teachers at the elementary or middle school levels. When all of the ratings in

in techniques and strategies were correlated with the teachers' present positions, the obtained chi-square reached the necessary table value to be significant at the .01 level. Cramer's V was computed resulting in a correlation coefficient of +.14, a significant correlation with limited predictability.

Educational Level Related to Services in
Assessment, Classroom Management, Skill
Development and Techniques
and Strategies

6 H₀: There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of service provided by resource teachers and teachers' level of educational training.

The statistical analysis relating to null hypothesis six is reported in table 13.

TABLE 13
PREDICATOR VARIABLE--SERVICES

Criterion Variable	Assessment			Classroom Management			Skill Development			Techniques and Strategies		
	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r
Educational Level	2.80	.92	-.12	2.77	.91	-.04	2.63	.92	-.07	2.66	.97	-.05
N = 336												
Mean = 1.64												
SD = .58												

Table 13 shows the relationship between the teachers' educational levels and their ratings of resource teacher services in assessment, in classroom management, skill development and techniques and strategies.

When the educational level was compared with the ratings of services provided in the area of assessment, classroom

management, skill development and techniques and strategies, there were no significant relationships found. Null hypothesis six was accepted and it may be concluded that there was no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of service provided by resource teachers and teachers' level of educational training.

Teaching Experience Related to Services Provided
in Assessment, Classroom Management, Skill
Development and Techniques and Strategies

7 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of service provided by resource teachers and number of years of teaching experience by the teachers.

The results of the data analysis for null hypothesis seven are shown in table 14.

TABLE 14

PREDICATOR VARIABLES--SERVICES

Criterion Variable	Assessment			Classroom Management			Skill Development			Techniques and Strategies		
	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r
Teaching Experience N = 3.36 Mean = 2.46 SD = 1.24	2.80	.92	.09*	2.77	.91	.09*	2.63	.92	.10*	2.66	.97	.07

*p .05

**p .01

Presented in table 14 are the data relevant to the relationship between the number of years of teaching experience and the teachers' ratings of services provided in the

areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development, and techniques and strategies. The means for the areas of assessment and classroom management (2.80 and 2.77 respectively) were slightly greater than the means for skill development and techniques and strategies (2.63 and 2.66 respectively). Variability for the four sub-areas was between .91 and .97. When teaching experience was compared with each sub-area there was no significant relationship found for the area of techniques and strategies. However, the correlation coefficient was significant at the .05 level for the areas of assessment, and at the .01 level for the areas of classroom management and skill development. Therefore, null hypothesis seven was rejected for the areas of assessment, classroom management and skill development but was accepted for the area of techniques and strategies.

Number of Courses Related to Services in
Assessment, Classroom Management, Skill
Development and Techniques and Management

- 8 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of service provided by resource teachers and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading.

The statistical analysis of data relevant to hypothesis eight is reported in table 15.

TABLE 15

PREDICATOR VARIABLE--SERVICES

Criterion Variable	Assessment			Classroom Management			Skill Development			Techniques and Strategies		
	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r	Mean	SD	r
Number of Courses	2.80	.92	.03	2.77	.91	.03	2.63	.92	.01	2.66	.97	.03
N = 3.31												
Mean = 2.80												
SD = .50												

Shown in table 15 is the comparison of the number of language arts/reading courses completed by teachers with their ratings of the services provided in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development and techniques and strategies. When the number of language arts/reading courses completed by teachers was compared with ratings of services provided in these sub-areas there was no statistical significant difference found in either sub-area.

In summary, the data in tables 9, 10, 11, and 12 indicated that the largest percentage of teachers were of the opinion that adequate services had been provided by resource teachers in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development and techniques and strategies. The data further indicated that a larger percentage of high school teachers were of the opinion that only minimum help had been provided in these areas than either elementary and middle school teachers. The difference in responses by the three groups indicated a statistically significant relationship

for the areas of assessment, classroom management, and techniques and strategies.

The data in tables 13, 14, and 15 indicated that the teachers' ratings of the services provided by resource teachers were similar when compared to educational training and courses completed in language arts/reading. There were no significant relationship found in either the comparison of educational training or the comparison of courses completed in language arts/reading. There were no significant relationship found in either the comparison of educational training or the comparison of courses completed in language arts and the ratings of services provided in assessment, classroom management, skill development and techniques and strategies.

Summarily, the data indicated a significant relationship between perceptions of services provided in the area of assessment, classroom management, and techniques and strategies and teachers' present positions and between the perceptions of services provided in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development and teachers' experience.

Question 3: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of assessment and the services provided in the area.

Hypotheses 9, 10, 11, and 12 were formulated to determine the relationship between teachers' perceived competence in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill

development and techniques and strategies and teachers' perceptions of the services provided in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development, and techniques and strategies.

Competence in Assessment and Services
Provided in Assessment

- 9 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived competence in assessment and teachers' perceptions of services provided in assessment.

The results of the data analysis for null hypotheses nine, ten, eleven and twelve are shown in table 16.

Table 16 shows the comparison of the teachers' ratings of competence in the area of assessment with teacher ratings of services provided in the area of assessment. When the perceived competence in assessment was compared with the services provided in assessment, a statistically significant relationship was found at the .001 level. The mean for competence in assessment was 3.74 and the standard deviation was .72.

The mean for the services provided in the area of assessment was 2.80 with the standard deviation of .92. The correlation coefficient reached the required significance at the .001 level and null hypothesis nine was rejected. These data indicated that there was a high positive correlation between the teachers' perceived level of competence and the services provided by resource teachers in the area of assessment. The level of predictability was limited.

TABLE 16

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX OF AREAS OF PERCEIVED
COMPETENCE AND SERVICES PROVIDED

Areas of Competence	Assessment	Areas of Services Provided		
		Classroom Management	Skill Development	Techniques and Strategies
1. Assessment	17***	.20	.17***	.20
2. Classroom Management		.22	.21	.24
3. Skill Development			.17***	.20
4. Techniques and Strategies				.20

***p < .001

Question 4: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of classroom management and the services provided in the area of classroom management?

Competence in Classroom Management and Services
Provided in Classroom Management

10 H₀: There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence in classroom management and perception of services provided in classroom management.

The data analysis for null hypothesis ten is presented in table 16.

Data in table 16 are related to comparison of the teachers' perceived competence in the area of classroom management with the ratings of services provided in the area of classroom management. When the perceived competence in

classroom management was correlated with the services provided in classroom management, there was no statistically significant relationship found. The correlation coefficient did not reach the required significance at the .05 level and null hypothesis ten was therefore accepted.

Question 5: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of skill development and the services provided in skill development?

Competence in Skill Development and Services
Provided in Skill Development

- 11 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence in skill development and services provided in skill development.

The statistical analysis relating to null hypothesis eleven is reported in table 16.

The data in table 16 reflect the comparison of teachers' perceived competence in the area of skill development with the ratings of services provided in the area of skill development. A statistically significant relationship was found at the .001 level when the perceived competence in skill development was correlated with the services provided in skill development. The mean for competence in skill development was 3.74 with a standard deviation of .91.

The mean for services provided in skill development was 2.63 with a standard deviation of .91. The data indicated that there was a positive correlation between the perceived level of competence and services provided in the area of skill development. Hypothesis eleven was rejected.

Question 6: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of techniques and strategies and services provided in techniques and strategies?

Competence in Techniques and Strategies
and Services Provided in Techniques
and Strategies

12 H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence in techniques and strategies and services provided in techniques and strategies.

Shown in table 16 are the results of the data analysis for null hypothesis twelve.

Table 16 shows the comparison of the teachers' ratings of competence in the area of techniques and strategies with teachers' ratings of services provided in the area of techniques and strategies. When the ratings of competence in techniques and strategies were compared with ratings of services provided in techniques and strategies, no statistical relationship was found. The correlation coefficient did not reach the required significant level, null hypothesis twelve was accepted.

In summary, the data in table 16 revealed that a highly significant relationship was found between the perceived level of competence and perceptions of services provided by resource teachers in the areas of assessment and skill development.

Summary of Findings Related to
Research Questions

Question 1: Is there a relationship between teachers' level of competence and their position, educational training teaching experience and/or the number of courses completed in language arts/reading?

- No relationship was found between teachers' (perceived) level of competence and their position (grade level).
- A statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' level of competence in the areas of techniques and strategies and teachers' educational training. No relationship was found between teachers' level of competence in the remaining aspects measured (assessment, classroom, skill development) and teacher' educational training.
- A statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' level of competence in one aspect measured (skill development) and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading. No statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' level of competence in the remaining three aspects measured (assessment, classroom management, techniques and strategies) and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading.

Question 2: Is there a relationship between the amount of services provided by resource teachers and teachers' present positions, educational training, teaching experience and/or courses completed in reading?

- A statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceptions of services provided by resource teachers in the three areas of assessment, classroom management, and techniques and strategies of teachers' present positions. No relationship was found between teachers' perceptions of services provided by resource teachers in the remaining area of skill development and teachers' present positions.
- No statistically significant relationship was found between the services provided by resource teachers in the four areas of assessment, classroom management, techniques and strategies, and skill development and teachers' educational training.
- A statistically significant relationship was found between the services provided by resource teachers in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development, and the teachers' experience. No statistically significant relationship was found between the services provided by resource teachers in the remaining area of techniques and strategies and teachers' experience.
- No statistically significant relationship was found between the services provided by resource teachers in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development, techniques and strategies, and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading.

Question 3: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the areas of assessment and the services provided in the area of assessment?

- A statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceived level of competence in assessment and their perceptions of services provided in the area of assessment.

Question 4: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the areas of classroom management

and services provided in classroom management.

- No statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceived level of competence in the area of classroom management and teachers' perceptions of services provided in the area of classroom management.

Question 5: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of skill development and services provided in skill development?

- A statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceived level of competence in skill development and teachers' perceptions of services provided in the area of skill development.

Question 6: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of techniques and strategies and services provided in the area of techniques and strategies?

- No statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceived level of competence in the area of techniques and strategies.

Discussion

This study focused on instructional needs of language arts/reading teachers and the services provided to these teachers by resource teachers. The data relating to the six questions and twelve hypotheses were organized in reference to four categories or aspects of the teaching of reading in elementary, middle and high school.

The first four hypotheses were concerned with determining the relationship between teachers' perceptions of competence in four aspects of reading (assessment, classroom management, skill development and techniques and strategies) and teachers' positions, educational training, teaching experience, and courses completed in reading.

The data showed that teachers hold similar perceptions of competence across the three teaching levels in all four categories of reading instruction. The chi-square analysis did not reveal a significant relationship between teachers' level of competence and teachers' position, educational training, years of teaching experience, or courses completed in language arts/reading for most of the four categories measured. Significant relationships were found between teachers' educational training and competence in the area of techniques and strategies (table 6); between teachers' experience and competence in assessment and techniques and strategies (table 7); and between the number of language arts/reading courses completed by teachers and the area of skill development (table 8).

A review of the literature revealed that teachers' perceptions of need differed according to teaching experience and grade level taught. One study examined the needs of 745 teachers, who taught at the elementary, junior high, and high school levels. The findings of the study indicated that, in general, teachers reported needing help in such areas as discipline and individualized instruction. However,

further analysis of the responses indicated differences as a function of years of teaching experience and grade level taught.¹ The current study does not appear to concur with the above research findings. When examined, teacher ratings in the current study were similar across all grade levels involved in the study, for each aspect of reading measured. The data show that approximately 95 percent of the teachers in this sample perceived themselves as competent in the four categories measured. In view of the efforts of the school system, over the past ten years, to improve the skill and performance of the elementary language arts/reading teacher this finding appears to be surprising at first glance. However, several factors may contribute to differences found in the study. An examination of the data in this study (table 7) showed that more than half of teachers in this sample have sixteen or more years of experience and that 85 percent of the teachers have completed three or more courses in language arts/reading (table 9). The sample included few beginning teachers (table 7) which suggests that the experience levels and training level of participants in this study are more similar than different. Declining enrollment and specific guidelines for federal and state programs have forced the transfer of many teachers from the elementary level to the middle or high school level.

¹Ingersoll, "Assessing Inservice Training Needs Through Responses," pp. 169-173.

The back to the "basics movement" and the large number of disabled readers at the middle and high school levels have created the need for more reading teachers or teachers with experience or training at the elementary level. Therefore, teachers on all levels may have benefited not only from higher educational training, but also from local school system efforts.

Hypotheses five, six, seven and eight were concerned with determining the relationship between teachers' perceptions of services provided by resource teachers and teachers' positions, educational training, teaching experience and the number of language arts/reading courses completed.

The data showed that the scope and nature of resource teacher services were different for some grade levels and experience levels. Significant relationships were found between teachers' perceptions of services provided by resource teachers and teachers' positions (tables 9, 10, and 12) and between teachers' perceptions of services provided in assessment, classroom management, skill development and the years of teaching experience (table 14).

Research studies which examined the roles and tasks performed by supervisors are somewhat limited. Few studies have been conducted which addressed the services provided to teachers of the specific nature sought in this current study. One such study, reviewed by the writer, which related to services provided by supervisors involved teachers of all grade levels in elementary school and nine subject areas in

secondary school. The major finding of this study was that supervisors were providing teachers the services that teachers viewed as important or relevant. It was also found that the more experienced teachers sought and received services to the same extent as less experienced teachers.¹ Findings from the current study indicated that the majority of the teachers were of the opinion that adequate service had been provided by resource teachers in the four areas measured; thus it was supportive of the findings in the literature.

Hypotheses nine, ten, eleven and twelve were concerned with determining the relationship between teachers' perceived competence in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development, and techniques and strategies and teachers' perceptions of services provided by resource teachers in the above four skills areas. The findings revealed a statistically significant relationship when the ratings indicating the level of competence in the areas of assessment and skill development were compared with ratings indicating the amount of service provided in the areas of assessment and skill development. Based on the data, the majority of teachers felt that they had adequate to mastery level competence in the areas measured; the majority perceived themselves as having received adequate help in the areas measured. Correlations between competence level and services provided in the areas of assessment and skill development were significantly related.

¹Clays, "Lola Gets What Lola Wants from Supervision," pp. 358-361.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a recapitulation of this study followed by the findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations.

Purpose

This study was concerned with the possible relationships of language arts teachers' perceptions of their instructional needs and their perceptions of the help provided to them by resource teachers. More specifically, an attempt was made to identify the teachers' perceived level of competency in four specific aspects of the teaching of reading--assessment, classroom management, skill development, techniques and strategies--and to determine the teachers' perceptions of the help provided to them by resource teachers in those selected areas.

Research Sample

The research sample for this study was drawn from the elementary, middle, and high schools in Area II of the Atlanta Public Schools. The participants included 239

elementary language arts teachers, thirty-three middle school language arts teachers and fifty-six high school language arts teachers. Each teacher responded to the Teacher Needs and Resource Teacher Services Questionnaire.

Instrument

The Teacher Needs and Resource Teacher Services Questionnaire is an 86-item instrument that is comprised of four aspects of the teaching of reading: assessment, classroom management, techniques and strategies and skill development. The instrument, developed by this researcher, was designed to obtain demographic information in part I with part II being divided into two sections. Section I of part II contained forty-three items aimed at identifying teachers' instructional needs and section II of part II contained forty-three similarly stated items aimed at determining the help provided to teachers.

Research Design

The research design used in this study was correlational, a form of the descriptive methodology. The correlational design involved a one-time administration of a questionnaire for the collection of sets of ratings from the sample of subjects and the determination of the relationship between those sets of ratings.

Definition of Terms

The following basic terms are defined as they were used throughout this study.

1. Level of Competence--refers to the teacher's perceived level of knowledge as indicated by the self-rating responses (results) on The Teacher Needs and Resource Teacher Services Questionnaire.
2. Assessment--refers to a group of skills listed on The Teacher Needs and Resource Teacher Services Questionnaire (TNRTSQ) which identify diagnostic techniques important in the teaching of reading.
3. Classroom Management--refers to a group of skills listed on the TNRTSQ as being essential in organizing students and materials for reading instruction.
4. Skill Development--refers to a group of skills listed on the TNRTSQ as being essential in teaching students to read.
5. Techniques and Strategies--refers to a group of skills listed on the TNRTSQ as being essential in teaching students to read.
6. Resource Teacher Services--refers to specialized help provided to teachers in the area of language arts/reading by selected resource teachers of Atlanta Public Schools as indicated by items listed on The Teacher Needs and Resource Teacher Services Questionnaire.
7. Resource Teacher--refers to staff personnel assigned to the area offices to provide instructional assistance to school faculties. They are often referred to by such titles as coordinator, director, consultant or curriculum specialist.
8. Relationship--is operationally defined as the degree to which correlation exists between two variables.
9. Supervision--the efforts to stimulate, coordinate, and guide the continuous growth of teachers so as to improve the quality of instruction.
10. Language Arts--refers to the teaching of one or all of the related skills of reading, writing, listening, speaking or English in general.

Summary of Related Literature

Literature related to this study was presented in the following four areas: (1) instructional needs and competencies of classroom teachers, (2) needs of beginning teachers, (3) needs assessment instruments, and (4) supervision of teachers. There is evidence to suggest that researchers have focused ample attention on the identification of needs of classroom teachers. However, more attention appears to have been focused on the needs of elementary teachers than on the needs of teachers at other grade levels. Most of the studies concerned with the identification of reading needs or general instructional needs of teachers sought the perceptions of the teachers through the use of a survey or questionnaire. Although findings of studies by Ingersoll, Otto and Smith, Cruickshank, Pigge and others revealed that needs differed according to grade level and teaching experience, concerns by teachers in general, included individualized instruction, motivating students and discipline. Another common thread found among the studies reviewed was the suggestion by researchers that perceptions of teachers should be sought and utilized but that more than teacher responses must be included in the inservice training process.

Researchers have substantially investigated the experiences and concerns of neophyte teachers. Studies by Fuller and Brown, Briscoe, Patanizek and others have revealed that beginning teachers move through three stages or concern

clusters. They are first concerned about self, later about their tasks and finally about their impact on students. Studies aimed at determining specific concerns of first year teachers reflected problems of classroom management, discipline and knowing students. From the research, there is ample evidence that staff development activities designed to address the concerns of beginning teachers would be most beneficial.

The method most often used in determining the needs of teachers is the needs assesement survey. A comprehensive needs assessment process is recommended by a number of authorities in the field of reading since the true needs of teachers are often hidden or are not recognized. Allen and Chester are among those who have offered suggestions for construction and samples of needs assessment instruments. They recommended that the survey includes a section of background information, choice of subjects or topics and a section on the respondent's preferences for types of staff development activities. The needs assessment process must also include ways to balance the needs perceived by the teachers and those perceived by the administrators.

The literature related to supervision points out the need for additional research related to supervision and the role and activities of instructional supervisors. Studies reviewed in this area are indicative of current practice and give clues as to problems to be resolved. The study conducted by Cardenas on the role and tasks performed

by supervisors indicated that the school personnel involved in the study were more in agreement as to what are not, than in agreement as to what are, the more important tasks of the supervisor.

Blumberg conducted a study which revealed that supervisors exhibited some of the same behavior which they discouraged on the part of teachers. In this study, which examined the behavior of supervisors in interviews with teachers, the supervisors did more talking than did the teachers, verbalized little encouragement and told teachers about alternatives far more frequently than they asked them. This study suggests that supervisors, like teachers, rarely analyze their own behavior, and are unaware of some of these problems.

Claye's study, which was aimed at finding out the kinds of services desired by teachers and the extent to which they received such services, revealed that a large percentage of neophyte and mature teachers desired and received supervisory services. The researcher suggested that the idea that older teachers no longer desire services of supervisors is not valid.

Specific Hypotheses and Questions

Twelve null hypotheses related to research questions were tested.

1. Is there a relationship between teachers' level of competence and their position, educational training, teaching experience, and/or the number of courses completed in language arts/reading?

- 1.1. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and their present position.
 - 1.2. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and their level of educational training.
 - 1.3. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and their number of years teaching experience.
 - 1.4. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of competence and their number of courses completed in language arts/reading.
2. Is there a relationship between the amount of service provided by resource teachers and teachers' present position, educational training, teaching experience and/or courses completed in reading?
- 2.5. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of services provided by resource teachers and teacher's present position.
 - 2.6. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of services provided by resource teachers and teacher's level of educational training.
 - 2.7. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of services provided by resource teachers and number of years of teaching experience by the teachers.

- 2.8. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the amount of services provided by resource teachers and number of courses completed in language arts/reading.
3. Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of assessment and the services provided in the area of assessment?
- 3.9. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' level of competence in assessment and services provided in assessment.
4. Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of classroom management and services provided in the area of classroom management?
- 4.10. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' level of competence in classroom management and services provided in classroom management.
5. Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of skill development and services provided in the area of skill development?
- 5.11. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' level of competence in skill development and services provided in skill development.
6. Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of techniques and strategies and services provided in the area of techniques and strategies?
- 6.12. H_0 : There will be no statistically significant relationship between teachers' level of competence in techniques and strategy and services provided in teacher and strategy.

Findings

Question 1: Is there a relationship between teachers' level of competence and their position, educational training teaching experience and/or the number of courses completed in language arts/reading?

- No relationship was found between teachers' (perceived) level of competence and their position (grade level).
- A statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' level of competence in the areas of techniques and strategies and teachers' educational training. No relationship was found between teachers' level of competence in the remaining aspects measured (assessment, classroom, skill development) and teachers' educational training.
- A statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' level of competence in one aspect measured (skill development) and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading. No statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' level of competence in the remaining three aspects measured (assessment, classroom management, techniques and strategies) and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading.

Question 2: Is there a relationship between the amount of services provided by resource teachers and teachers' present positions, educational training, teaching experience and/or courses completed in reading?

- A statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceptions of services provided by resource teachers in the three areas of assessment, classroom management, and techniques and strategies and teachers' present positions. No relationship was found between teachers' perceptions

of services provided by resource teachers in the remaining area of skill development and teachers' present positions.

- No statistically significant relationship was found between the services provided by resource teachers in the four areas of assessment, classroom management, techniques and strategies, and skill development and teachers' educational training.
- A statistically significant relationship was found between the services provided by resource teachers in the areas of assessment, classroom management, skill development, and the teacher's experience. No statistically significant relationship was found between the services provided by resource teachers in the remaining area of techniques and strategies and teachers' experience.
- No statistically significant relationship was found between the services provided by resource teachers in the area of assessment, classroom management, skill development, techniques and strategies, and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading.

Question 3: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the areas of assessment and the services provided in the area of assessment?

- A statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceived level of competence in assessment and their perceptions of services provided in the area of assessment.

Question 4: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the areas of classroom management and services provided in classroom management?

- No statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceived level of competence in the area of classroom management and teachers' perceptions of services provided in the area of classroom management.

Question 5: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of skill development and services provided in skill development?

- A statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceived level of competence in skill development and teachers' perceptions of services provided in the area of skill development.

Question 6: Is there a relationship between the level of competence in the area of techniques and strategies and services provided in the area of techniques and strategies?

- No statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceived level of competence in the area of techniques and strategies.

Conclusions

An analysis of the basic findings of this study warranted the formulation of the following conclusions:

1. Teacher position is independent of teachers' perceptions of competence.
2. Teachers' educational training appeared to be associated with their perceptions of competence in the area of techniques and strategies, but not on the area of classroom management.
3. Teaching experience was associated with their perceptions of competence in the area of assessment and techniques and strategies, but independent of the areas of classroom management and skill development.
4. The number of courses in language arts/reading tended to be related to teachers' perceptions of competence in skill development and educational training. While techniques and strategies appeared to be related by level of training, it was not related to the number of courses completed in language arts.

5. The nature and scope of resource teacher services were perceived differently according to grade levels and experience levels of the teachers served. The higher the grade level, the more limited the perception of the services tended to be.
6. Resource teacher services tended to be independent of educational training and the number of courses completed in language arts/reading.
7. Resource teacher services provided in the areas of assessment and skill development tended to be related to perception of competence in the areas of assessment and skill development.
8. Services provided by resource teachers in the areas of classroom management and techniques and strategies appeared to be independent of teacher perception of competence in the areas of classroom management and techniques and strategies.

Implications

On the basis of the aforementioned findings and conclusions, the following implications are drawn:

1. Similar perceptions of competence are held regardless of the teacher's position (grade level).
2. Higher level educational training tends to focus more on techniques and strategies while local school system efforts tend to focus more on the areas of assessment, classroom management, and skill development.
3. Competence in techniques and strategies seems to be enhanced by training, while assessment is developed through teaching experience.
4. Courses in language arts/reading appear to concentrate more on skill development than on other areas investigated.
5. Experienced teachers at specific grade levels appear to have received more training than teachers at other grade levels.

6. Resource teacher services are provided equally to the trained and untrained teachers.
7. The resource teacher services provided reflect the program goals and available manpower for such services in the different areas measured.
8. Courses in language arts/reading appear to have focused on skill development appropriate for that area, while techniques and strategies may have been obtained through increased experiences and educational training which may have included courses other than language arts.

Recommendations

The findings, conclusions and implications gave justification to the following recommendations:

1. That teachers' perceptions of competence should be validated through other measures to determine the accuracy and reliability of these programs.
2. That higher education institutions and staff development programs consider systematically determining the nature and scope of training needed and base their efforts on the identified needs.
3. That additional resource services be provided to teachers at the middle and high school levels.
4. That additional research studies be conducted on the roles and functions of supervisors in all areas related to inservice teacher training.
5. That specific research be conducted to determine the relationship between teacher perceived competence and learner achievement as well as teacher perceived competence and measured competence.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30314

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

November 17, 1983

Mrs. Josephine W. Jackson
3770 Rockport Place, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30331

Dear Mrs. Jackson:

I am pleased to inform you that your thesis advisory committee has approved your thesis proposal.

Congratulations and you have our best wishes as you work to complete your thesis. Call the members of your committee when you need their assistance.

Sincerely,



Charles E. Davis
Chairperson
Thesis Advisory Committee

CED/et



ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF AREA II
TELEPHONE: 873-5252

978 NORTH AVENUE, N. E.

ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30306

DR. A. A. DAWSON
AREA SUPERINTENDENT

November 21, 1983

MRS. JOAN ZION
ASST. AREA SUPERINTENDENT

Dr. Myrtice M. Taylor
Division of Research, Evaluation
and Data Processing
210 Pryor Street, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30335

Dear Dr. Taylor:

I am a Resource Teacher in the Area II Office presently pursuing an Ed.S. Degree at Atlanta University. I would like to conduct a research study involving schools located within Area II. The study will address instructional needs of selected teachers and services provided to these teachers by selected area resource teachers. Area II was selected because I am well acquainted with the operational procedures for resource teachers.

Enclosed are the ten copies of the Prospectus and Questionnaire to be used in the research as was requested in the "Guidelines for Research Activities in The Atlanta Public Schools".

Thank you for your assistance in this regard.

Sincerely,

Josephine W. Jackson

Encl.



-120-

ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

210 PRYOR STREET, S. W.

ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

January 9, 1984

Mrs. Josephine W. Jackson
Area II Office

Dear Mrs. Jackson:

Your proposal to conduct a study which will "address instructional needs of selected teachers and services provided to teachers" has been approved.

You may proceed with the conduct of your study on the condition that you consider the suggested modifications and receive the consent and cooperation of the principals of the schools to be involved.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your program of study.

Sincerely,

Myrtice M. Taylor
Research Associate



ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF AREA II
TELEPHONE: 873-5252

978 NORTH AVENUE, N. E.

ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30306

DR. A. A. DAWSON
AREA SUPERINTENDENT

January 31, 1984

MRS. JOAN ZION
ASST. AREA SUPERINTENDENT

Dear Teacher:

I am conducting a study to determine language arts teachers' perceptions of instructional needs and perceptions of the level of help provided to them by language arts resource teachers. As you are aware, language arts resource teachers work together with reading center personnel and other city-wide coordinators to provide specialized help to teachers of language arts/reading in many different forms. Knowing the specific reading areas in which you feel you need help and the level of help which has been provided to you will enable resource teachers to serve your needs better. It is, therefore, most important that I get your opinion in order to make this study meaningful.

The results of this study will be used by resource teachers and other staff developers in facilitating change and improvement in services and staff development activities which could result in positive professional growth for teachers. I am asking that you take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it to your principal within three days.

Your identity with this study is anonymous. No attempt will be made to identify you as a participant. A pre-addressed envelope is enclosed for the return of the questionnaire. The envelope which contains your name is not to be returned. The data will not be reported in any form that will identify any school. Please return the completed questionnaire to your principal who will return all questionnaires from your school to me.

I appreciate greatly your cooperation in this project.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Josephine W. Jackson

JWJ/ac

APPENDIX B

TEACHER NEEDS AND RESOURCE TEACHER
SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHER NEEDS AND RESOURCE TEACHER SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

The major goal of the resource teacher is that of improving the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom. Language arts resource teachers provide specialized help to teachers of language arts/reading in many different forms. The effectiveness of these services depends in part upon whether or not the services respond to areas of need felt by teachers.

There are two (2) parts to this questionnaire. The items in Part I seek information about you, the respondent. The items in Part II are divided into two sections: Section One deals with teachers' inservice needs in reading and Section Two deals with services provided to teachers by resource teachers.

Part I. Demographic Information

Directions: Please circle the number of the most appropriate response for each item.

- | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|-----|--|
| 1.0 | Present Position | 2.0 | Educational Level |
| 1.1 | Teacher - Elementary School: K-7 | 2.1 | Bachelor's Degree |
| 1.2 | Teacher - Middle School: 6-8 | 2.2 | Master's Degree |
| 1.3 | Teacher - High School: 8-12 | 2.3 | Education Specialist Degree |
| | | 2.4 | Doctoral Degree |
| 3.0 | Years of Teaching Experience | 4.0 | Number of Courses Completed in Language Arts/Reading |
| 3.1 | - 1 to 5 | 4.1 | - 1 |
| 3.2 | - 6 to 10 | 4.2 | - 2 |
| 3.3 | - 11 to 15 | 4.3 | - 3 or more |
| 3.4 | - 16 to 20 | | |
| 3.5 | - More than 20 | | |

This questionnaire is designed to obtain your opinions regarding your instructional needs in the area of language arts/reading and the services provided to you in this area by language arts resource teachers.

Part II, Section One. Present Level of Competence

Directions: Please rate each of the items in Section One by circling the number which corresponds to how competent you feel in the area listed. Use the scale supplied at the top of each page. For example, if you feel you have "no competency" in a skill, circle "01", or if you feel that you have "above average competency", circle "04".

01 = No Competency

04 = Above Average Competency

02 = Limited Competency

05 = Mastery

03 = Adequate Competency

Assessment	Teacher Needs		Responses		
	01 No Competency	02 Limited Competency	03 Adequate Competency	04 Above Average Competency	05 Mastery
1. Using available diagnostic information to determine the level on which each student should be instructed, such as end of level test, pacing reports, informal reading inventories	01	02	03	04	05
2. Using available diagnostic information to plan appropriate instruction for students	01	02	03	04	05
3. Administering diagnostic reading tests such as basal placement tests, <u>Stanford Diagnostic Reading Tests</u> and <u>Mastery Learning Assessment Tests</u>	01	02	03	04	05
4. Interpreting diagnostic reading tests such as basal placement tests, <u>Stanford Diagnostic Reading Tests</u> and <u>Mastery Learning Assessment Tests</u>	01	02	03	04	05
5. Administering other standardized reading tests	01	02	03	04	05
6. Interpreting results of other standardized reading tests	01	02	03	04	05

	Teacher Needs	Responses				
	01 No Competency	02 Limited Competency	03 Adequate Competency	04 Above Average Competency	05 Mastery	
<u>Assessment</u>						
7. Using the information gained from standardized tests such as GCRT, GBST, CAT to plan appropriate instruction for students	01	02	03	04	05	
8. Diagnosing specific reading difficulties of individual students	01	02	03	04	05	
<u>Classroom Management</u>						
1. Determining appropriate instructional groups for students	01	02	03	04	05	
2. Pacing instruction in accordance with student performance	01	02	03	04	05	
3. Using selected basal reading series effectively	01	02	03	04	05	
4. Managing effectively two (2) or more groups during the reading time block	01	02	03	04	05	
5. Identifying the minimum skills in basal or other core reading materials which are essential for student progression to next grade level	01	02	03	04	05	
6. Using supplementary materials properly	01	02	03	04	05	
7. Adapting instruction for various exceptionalities such as gifted, remedial, retained	01	02	03	04	05	
8. Managing the language arts time block effectively	01	02	03	04	05	
9. Securing a variety of supplementary materials such as skill boxes, learning centers, newspapers for language arts	01	02	03	04	05	
10. Developing well written lesson plans which include objectives, procedures, materials and evaluations	01	02	03	04	05	
11. Implementing well written lesson plans	01	02	03	04	05	
12. Developing appropriate long range plans	01	02	03	04	05	
13. Constructing and using tests for assessing and evaluating academic progress	01	02	03	04	05	

	Teacher Needs		Responses		
	01 No Competency	02 Limited Competency	03 Adequate Competency	04 Above Average Competency	05 Mastery
<u>Skill Development</u>					
1. Using writing, speaking and listening in reading instruction	01	02	03	04	05
2. Teaching specific reading comprehension skills	01	02	03	04	05
3. Instructing students in research and study skills	01	02	03	04	05
4. Teaching dictionary skills	01	02	03	04	05
5. Teaching word recognition skills in a meaningful context	01	02	03	04	05
6. Asking questions that encourage students' use of higher-level thinking	01	02	03	04	05
7. Teaching "survival" reading skills such as schedules, signs, directions	01	02	03	04	05
8. Teaching students to express written thoughts effectively using Standard English	01	02	03	04	05
9. Teaching test-taking skills	01	02	03	04	05
10. Improving student performance on standardized and criterion-referenced tests	01	02	03	04	05
11. Teaching students to apply reading skills through a variety of activities and projects	01	02	03	04	05
12. Providing for vocabulary skills development	01	02	03	04	05
13. Involving parents in the reading program	01	02	03	04	05
<u>Techniques and Strategies</u>					
1. Using a variety of instructional strategies to teach reading such as direct instruction, peer learning, small group instruction	01	02	03	04	05
2. Conducting a directed reading activity	01	02	03	04	05
3. Implementing the Mastery Learning concept	01	02	03	04	05
4. Developing strategies designed to motivate students	01	02	03	04	05
5. Helping students move beyond the minimum skills	01	02	03	04	05

Techniques and Strategies	Teacher Needs		Responses		
	01 No Competency	02 Limited Competency	03 Adequate Competency	04 Above Average Competency	05 Mastery
6. Implementing instruction for remedial students who must be taught only by the regular classroom teacher	01	02	03	04	05
7. Coordinating classroom instruction for remedial students who must be taught by the regular classroom teacher and the remedial reading teacher	01	02	03	04	05
8. Determining strategies for teaching superior readers	01	02	03	04	05
9. Developing appropriate language arts components of the school-wide objective plan	01	02	03	04	05

Part II, Section Two. Services provided by Resource Teachers

Directions: Please rate each of the items in Section Two by circling the number which corresponds to the extent to which you feel you have been provided service in the area listed. Use the scale supplied at the top of page 6, 7, and 8. For example, if you feel that "limited help" has been provided, circle "02", or if you feel "extensive help" has been provided, circle "05".

01 = No Help Provided

04 = Much Help Provided

02 = Limited Help Provided

05 = Extensive Help Provided

03 = Adequate Help Provided

Assessment	Services of Resource Teachers		Responses		
	01	02	03	04	05
	No Help Provided	Limited Help Provided	Adequate Help Provided	Much Help Provided	Extensive Help Provided
1. Assisting teachers with correct placement of students in basal materials	01	02	03	04	05
2. Assisting teachers with the use of diagnostic information in planning instruction for students	01	02	03	04	05
3. Providing staff development focused on the selection and administration of diagnostic reading tests	01	02	03	04	05
4. Providing staff development focused on the interpretation of diagnostic reading tests	01	02	03	04	05
5. Assisting teachers with the administration of standardized tests	01	02	03	04	05
6. Assisting teachers with the interpretation of standardized test results	01	02	03	04	05
7. Providing staff development designed to promote appropriate utilization of standardized test results	01	02	03	04	05
8. Suggesting materials and procedures for diagnosing specific reading difficulties of individual students	01	02	03	04	05
<u>Classroom Management</u>					
1. Suggesting appropriate grouping strategies for school and/or teacher	01	02	03	04	05
2. Providing information related to appropriate pacing of instruction	01	02	03	04	05
3. Providing staff development related to effective use of basal series	01	02	03	04	05
4. Conducting inservice workshops regarding instructional management of reading groups	01	02	03	04	05
5. Assisting teachers with the identification and teaching of minimum skills in basal and other materials	01	02	03	04	05
6. Suggesting effective use of supplementary materials	01	02	03	04	05
7. Providing staff development related to ways of adapting instruction for various exceptionalities, such as gifted, retained, remedial	01	02	03	04	05

	Services of Resource Teachers		Responses		
	01 No Help Provided	02 Limited Help Provided	03 Adequate Help Provided	04 Much Help Provided	05 Extensive Help Provided
<u>Classroom Management</u>					
8. Suggesting and demonstrating techniques for integrating and varying language arts activities	01	02	03	04	05
9. Aiding teachers in securing supplementary materials	01	02	03	04	05
10. Providing assistance and models of well written lesson plans	01	02	03	04	05
11. Observing and providing feedback related to the implementation of lesson plans	01	02	03	04	05
12. Assisting teachers in developing long range plans	01	02	03	04	05
13. Aiding teachers in designing teacher-made tests	01	02	03	04	05
<u>Skill Development</u>					
1. Helping teachers develop reading plans which incorporate writing, speaking and listening skills	01	02	03	04	05
2. Conducting workshops related to identification of and strategies for teaching reading comprehension skills	01	02	03	04	05
3. Providing workshops related to effective teaching of research and study skills	01	02	03	04	05
4. Suggesting techniques for teaching dictionary skills	01	02	03	04	05
5. Conducting workshops regarding effective ways to teach word recognition skills	01	02	03	04	05
6. Assisting teachers with the construction of questions that encourage students' use of higher-level thinking	01	02	03	04	05
7. Suggesting ways and materials for teaching survival skills	01	02	03	04	05
8. Encouraging teachers to involve students in activities and projects designed to give practice in written thoughts using standard English	01	02	03	04	05
9. Conducting workshops on test-taking skills	01	02	03	04	05

	Services of Resource Teachers		Responses		
	01 No Help Provided	02 Limited Help Provided	03 Adequate Help Provided	04 Much Help Provided	05 Extensive Help Provided
<u>Skill Development</u>					
10. Providing inservice training on methods of improving students' Performance on standardized and criterion-referenced tests	01	02	03	04	05
11. Encouraging student participation in activities which provide opportunities for application of skills such as reading clubs, language festivals	01	02	03	04	05
12. Suggesting a variety of techniques for teaching vocabulary skills	01	02	03	04	05
13. Assisting teachers in providing workshops for parents	01	02	03	04	05
<u>Techniques and Strategies</u>					
1. Identifying and assisting teachers with the use of various instructional strategies in the teaching of reading	01	02	03	04	05
2. Conducting workshops on the directed reading concept	01	02	03	04	05
3. Providing staff development related to the use of mastery learning concept and mastery learning units	01	02	03	04	05
4. Conducting faculty workshops on motivational strategies for learners	01	02	03	04	05
5. Aiding teachers in providing challenging and enriching experiences for students	01	02	03	04	05
6. Suggesting materials, strategies and activities for teaching the disabled reader in the classroom	01	02	03	04	05
7. Providing information and assistance to teachers relating to the coordination of classroom/resource room instruction for remedial students	01	02	03	04	05
8. Suggesting materials and strategies for teaching superior readers	01	02	03	04	05
9. Assisting teachers in developing language arts activities designed to achieve components of the school-wide plan	01	02	03	04	05

DATA BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHER

- (1) ASSESSMENT
 (2) CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
 (3) SKILL DEVELOPMENT
 (4) TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

ID	SCHOOL	ASSIGNMENT	EDUCATION	YEARS EXPERIENCE	NUMBER OF COURSES	NEEDS				SERVICES				TOTAL
						1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
2						3.63	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.17	3.38	3.00	3.13	3.56
42						5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.85	4.46	5.00	4.90
62						4.00	3.69	4.85	4.56	4.88	4.38	4.15	4.22	4.33
80			MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.13	3.85	3.92	4.00	3.13	3.31	3.00	3.44	3.58
81														00
107						4.75	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.08	4.00	4.49
121						3.00	3.00	3.00	2.89	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.99
159						4.00	4.00	3.54	3.67	4.50	4.85	3.85	4.11	4.06
241						5.00	4.77	4.62	4.63	2.00	1.62	1.31	1.00	3.04
327			MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.00	4.54	5.00	4.56	1.75	1.69	1.23	1.33	3.03
1	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		3.00	2.77	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.97
3	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	2		3.13	3.46	3.31	3.56	2.00	1.00	2.69	3.00	2.76
4	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		2.75	3.54	3.85	3.78	3.00	2.92	2.69	2.67	3.18
5	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.00	4.08	3.92	4.00	2.50	2.85	3.46	3.44	3.55
6	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.25	3.46	3.38	3.11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.16
7	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.13	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.88	3.00	3.00
8	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		2.75	3.23	3.23	3.00	2.50	2.69	2.77	2.67	2.88
9	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		2.50	2.69	2.85	2.44	1.75	1.85	1.15	1.44	2.09
10	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		3.00	2.92	3.38	3.22	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.07
11	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.00	4.15	4.08	4.11	2.50	3.23	3.25	2.89	3.56
12	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		4.25	4.46	4.00	3.67	3.00	2.46	2.46	2.33	3.33
13	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		4.63	4.69	4.92	4.56	4.00	4.69	4.31	4.88	4.60
14	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20			5.00	4.92	5.00	4.89	1.00	1.46	1.31	1.56	3.15
15	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.13	3.08	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.92	3.00	3.00	3.01
18	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.50	4.25	3.54	3.89					3.81
24	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		4.75	3.15	2.92	3.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.20
26	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.50	3.69	3.54	3.44	3.00	2.38	1.31	1.33	2.76
27	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		4.38	4.23	4.00	3.78					4.09
28	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		4.00	3.92	3.92	3.67	2.13	1.85	1.69	1.89	2.87
29	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE		3.88	4.31	4.23	4.44	4.00	3.92	3.69	3.89	4.05
30	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.50	3.38	3.69	3.78	3.00	3.00	2.46	2.67	3.17
31	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00					3.00
33	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.75	3.69	4.77	4.33	4.00	3.00	3.08	3.00	3.69
34	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		2.88	2.92	2.77	3.44	1.63	1.38	1.08	1.11	2.13
35	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.25	4.08	4.08	3.78	4.13	3.69	4.00	3.67	3.95
36	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	2		2.63	2.62	2.46	2.67	1.25	1.77	2.31	2.33	2.27
38	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.00	3.77	3.23	3.56	3.25	3.38	2.62	3.44	3.28
39	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	2		3.63	4.69	3.77	4.44	3.38	3.08	2.46	2.44	3.49
40	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.63	4.46	4.42	4.44	3.13	2.25	2.92	3.44	3.68
41	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		4.13	4.25	4.08	4.00	4.38	3.92	4.00	4.33	4.12

- (1) ASSESSMENT
- (2) CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
- (3) SKILL DEVELOPMENT
- (4) TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

SCHCOL		YEARS		NUMBER		NEEDS				SERVICES				TOTAL
10	ASSIGNMENT	EDUCATION	EXPERIENCE		OF COURSES	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
43	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	3.38	3.08	3.08	3.00	3.29	3.23	3.08	3.00	3.13
44	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	3.00	3.00	2.45	2.89	3.00	2.77	2.77	3.00	2.85
45	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	3.38	3.62	3.69	3.44	2.38	3.15	3.31	3.22	3.31
46	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	3.50	3.75	3.69	3.38	4.13	4.08	3.92	3.63	3.78
52	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	1 TO 5	2		3.25	3.38	3.85	4.11	2.75	2.77	2.00	2.33	3.05
53	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3	OR MORE	4.57	3.77	3.38	3.33	3.00	3.50	4.18	4.22	3.73
54	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3	OR MORE	3.25	3.54	3.77	3.89	3.38	2.54	2.08	2.11	3.05
55	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	3.63	3.69	3.77	3.56	3.63	3.54	3.62	3.56	3.63
56	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3	OR MORE	2.88	3.08	3.08	3.00	2.50	2.75	2.85	2.78	2.88
59	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3	OR MORE	4.63	4.46	4.23	3.89	2.13	1.62	1.77	1.11	2.98
63	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3	OR MORE	3.00	3.00	3.08	3.44	3.38	3.54	4.62	4.44	3.58
64	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	3.50	3.77	3.73	4.11	1.50	1.31	1.38	1.33	2.55
65	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	1 TO 5	2		2.38	2.92	3.23	3.00	1.38	3.36	2.08	2.67	2.69
66	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3	OR MORE	3.50	3.54	3.55	3.78	3.80	4.00			3.63
67	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20			4.13	4.08	3.69	4.00	3.00	3.38	3.08	3.11	3.55
68	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	2.88	3.50	3.58	3.89	3.38	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.27
69	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	3.50	3.42	3.62	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.31
70	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	4.75	4.31	3.92	3.67	2.50	2.00	2.15	1.83	3.19
71	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	1		3.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.48
72	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	4.00	4.00	3.85	3.78	4.50	4.31	4.54	5.00	4.23
73	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	2		4.38	4.23	4.23	4.44	3.13	4.38	4.00	4.33	4.16
74	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	5.00	5.00	4.92	4.89	1.13	1.62	1.00	1.00	3.08
75	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3	OR MORE	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.36	3.33	3.25	4.18
76	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3	OR MORE	4.00	3.92	3.69	3.89	4.00	3.85	3.69	3.67	3.83
77	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3	OR MORE	3.25	4.15	3.69	3.78	1.38	1.46	1.00	1.11	2.50
78	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	1 TO 5	2		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.88	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.99
79	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	3.75	3.85	3.67	3.56	3.00	3.00	3.38	4.22	3.54
82	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	3.50	4.08	4.38	4.00	3.00	3.38	3.85	4.11	3.83
83	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3	OR MORE	3.00	3.00	3.38	3.22	3.00	3.00	2.92	2.78	3.05
84	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3	OR MORE	5.00	4.75	4.54	4.56	3.38	2.77	1.85	2.22	3.58
85	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	4.25	3.85	3.46	3.67	3.38	3.31	2.69	2.67	3.38
87	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	3.50	3.85	3.85	3.89	4.00	3.92	2.92	3.00	3.62
89	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	2.86	2.92	2.92	2.89	2.29	2.67	2.00	3.00	2.69
91	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	4.13	4.69	4.00	4.67	1.88	3.15	2.92	3.56	3.65
92	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	4.13	4.92	4.69	5.00	1.88	3.15	2.85	3.56	3.81
93	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	3.00	3.17	3.15	3.00	2.50	2.25	2.11	2.33	2.72
94	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	3.25	3.23	3.38	3.22	2.75	3.08	3.00	3.00	3.13
95	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	2		5.00	5.00	4.92	5.00	3.00	2.08	2.38	2.22	3.67
96	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3	OR MORE	4.75	4.62	4.38	4.67	2.88	3.31	3.08	2.89	3.83
97	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3	OR MORE	4.63	4.92	4.38	4.56	3.00	2.92	2.08	2.00	3.56

(CONTINUED)

DATA BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHER

- (1) ASSESSMENT
 (2) CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
 (3) SKILL DEVELOPMENT
 (4) TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

SCHCOL		YEARS		NUMBER		NEEDS				SERVICES				TOTAL
ID	ASSIGNMNT	EDUCATION	EXPERIENCE	OF COURSES		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
98	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		5.00	4.77	4.85	4.50	3.50	2.77	2.54	1.33	3.65
99	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		3.86	4.69	4.00	4.44	3.63	3.25	2.54	2.78	3.64
100	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.38	3.23	3.15	3.00	2.17	2.46	1.58	1.63	2.61
101	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.38	3.15	3.08	3.22	1.88	1.77	1.46	1.22	2.38
103	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		5.00	5.00	4.85	4.78	3.00	2.58	2.85	2.67	3.86
104	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		4.38	4.08	3.46	3.88	2.63	1.62	1.15	1.22	2.73
105	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.63	4.50	4.23	4.33	2.50	2.23	2.62	3.00	3.47
106	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.43	3.46	3.31	4.00	4.27
108	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		3.88	3.69	3.85	3.78	1.00	1.23	1.31	1.11	2.49
109	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		3.75	3.23	3.15	3.11	3.00	2.85	2.31	2.33	2.94
110	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	1		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
110	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		3.50	3.62	3.62	3.89	3.00	3.38	3.85	3.78	3.59
112	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE		3.75	3.69	3.54	3.56	4.00	3.62	3.46	4.00	3.67
114	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.00	3.92	4.00	3.78	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.78	4.29
118	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		4.63	4.46	4.54	5.00	4.71	4.54	4.38	4.33	4.55
119	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	2		2.75	2.92	3.08	2.67	3.00	2.85	2.85	3.00	2.90
120	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.75	3.85	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.08	2.38	2.11	3.33
122	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.88	2.77	2.23	2.00	2.73
123	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	2		3.00	3.31	3.00	3.11	3.13	2.54	2.08	2.00	2.76
124	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.88	3.77	3.54	4.00	1.63	1.31	1.23	1.00	2.52
126	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.00	3.08	3.08	3.11	3.25	2.92	2.92	3.00	3.03
127	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		4.00	3.92	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.92	2.92	3.00	3.47
128	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		4.13	3.85	4.31	3.89	3.00	3.92	4.00	3.44	3.86
129	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		3.00	4.00	3.38	3.56	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.30
130	ELEMENTARY					2.75	3.00	3.00	2.89	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.96
131	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.25	3.73	3.00	4.00	3.50	4.08	3.54	4.00	3.73
132	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.00	3.46	3.69	3.44	1.50	1.00	1.62	2.00	2.47
133	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		4.00	4.00	3.85	4.00	2.38	2.62	3.00	3.00	3.36
134	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		4.00	4.00	4.15	3.89	3.38	2.69	2.69	2.56	3.41
135	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.00	3.31	3.62	3.33	2.00	2.23	2.31	2.11	2.86
136	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		4.75	4.92	4.69	5.00	5.00	4.62	3.23	4.11	4.50
137	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE		3.63	3.15	3.23	3.22	3.25	3.38	3.08	3.00	3.23
138	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		2.88	3.62	3.54	3.89	2.75	3.23	2.15	2.56	3.09
139	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	2		2.43	2.46	3.23	2.33	2.50	2.38	1.50	1.13	2.29
140	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		2.88	3.08	3.38	3.11	2.67	2.92	2.75	3.00	3.00
141	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		3.13	2.92	3.38	3.11	1.38	1.42	1.00	1.22	2.20
142	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		4.14	3.38	3.69	3.63	4.13	3.85	3.85	3.88	3.78
143	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		5.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.97
144	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.63	4.00	3.85	4.11	2.25	1.46	1.31	1.00	2.69
145	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		3.63	4.77	4.00	3.89	3.38	2.50	1.85	2.11	3.28

(CONTINUED)

DATA BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHER

- (1) ASSESSMENT
 (2) CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
 (3) SKILL DEVELOPMENT
 (4) TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

SCHOOL		YEARS		NUMBER		NEEDS				SERVICES				TOTAL
ID	ASSIGNMENT	EDUCATION	EXPERIENCE		OF COURSES	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
146	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	3.14	2.92	2.85	2.63	3.00	3.00	2.77	2.44	2.84
149	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	3.75	3.38	3.69	3.78	3.13	3.08	2.31	2.86	3.23
150	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	5.00	4.54	4.00	4.11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.69
151	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	3.00	2.86	3.15	3.11	1.00	1.80	1.75	1.25	2.34
155	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10		3 OR MORE	4.13	4.38	4.27	4.44	3.38	3.33	3.00	3.13	3.77
156	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	3.63	3.38	3.08	3.11	2.00	2.23	2.00	2.44	2.72
157	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.38	3.09	2.92	3.11	3.05
158	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	3.00	2.92	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.99
160	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	5.00	4.08	3.77	3.78	2.00	2.15	2.46	2.22	3.16
161	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	3.00	3.08	3.00	3.00	3.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.04
162	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10		3 OR MORE	3.63	4.00	3.77	4.00	2.13	1.77	1.85	2.00	2.88
163	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	3.50	3.15	3.54	3.44	3.00	2.92	2.92	3.00	3.18
164	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.08	3.15	2.89	3.52
165	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	3.38	3.15	2.85	2.78	2.63	2.00	2.62	1.89	2.70
166	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	5.00	4.46	4.31	4.44	3.25	2.92	2.15	2.33	3.57
167	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	2.25	2.23	2.23	2.11	2.00	1.38	1.08	1.11	1.78
168	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10		3 OR MORE	3.38	3.54	3.15	3.22	2.00	2.31	2.00	2.11	2.72
193	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	3.13	3.92	3.54	3.67	3.00	3.15	3.31	3.00	3.37
194	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN	20	2	4.00	4.54	4.00	4.22	3.00	2.77	2.77	3.00	3.53
195	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	4.50	4.92	4.46	3.78	4.63	5.00	4.69	5.00	4.65
196	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15		3 OR MORE	3.88	4.00	3.85	3.78	2.88	2.92	3.15	2.89	3.43
197	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10		1	3.88	4.00	3.85	3.78	2.88	2.92	3.15	2.89	3.43
198	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.77	2.92	2.78	2.93
201	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15		3 OR MORE	4.25	4.31	4.27	4.25	2.00	2.62	2.75	3.71	3.50
202	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	3.00	2.92	2.92	3.11	4.13	4.54	4.38	4.44	3.69
203	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10		3 OR MORE	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.38	2.46	2.46	3.00	2.78
204	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15		3 OR MORE	3.13	3.00	2.85	2.78	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.97
205	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10		2	3.25	2.92	2.85	3.00	1.25	1.54	1.54	1.00	2.17
206	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10		3 OR MORE	3.00	3.15	3.00	2.78	3.00	2.62	2.62	2.56	2.84
207	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15		3 OR MORE	3.75	3.62	3.62	3.13	2.13	2.31	2.31	2.44	2.92
208	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.00	3.00	3.23	3.92	3.11	3.73
214	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	3.13	3.15	2.92	3.22	3.00	2.77	2.77	2.89	2.97
215	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	4.88	4.77	4.77	4.67	2.38	2.77	1.38	1.44	3.38
216	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20		3 OR MORE	5.00	4.69	4.23	4.11	2.88	2.54	2.46	2.44	3.52
217	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10		3 OR MORE	3.50	3.54	3.54	3.67	3.13	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.29
218	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	5.00	4.77	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.97
219	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	MORE THAN	20	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.00	2.92	2.89	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.98
220	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	1 TO 5		1	4.25	3.92	3.92	4.22	4.88	4.31	3.62	3.00	3.99
221	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15		3 OR MORE	3.50	4.38	4.69	4.25	2.50	2.77	2.08	1.89	3.29
222	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20		1	5.00	4.27	4.00	4.00	2.75	3.23	2.46	2.78	3.46

(CONTINUED)

DATA BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHER

- (1) ASSESSMENT
 (2) CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
 (3) SKILL DEVELOPMENT
 (4) TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

ID	SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT	EDUCATION	YEARS EXPERIENCE	NUMBER OF COURSES	NEEDS				SERVICES				TOTAL
					1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
223	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.00	4.38	4.31	4.00	2.00	1.85	1.31	1.00	2.87
225	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.38	3.15	3.78	2.00	2.23	1.00	1.22	2.47
226	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.00	3.85	3.92	3.56	3.00	3.08	2.92	2.78	3.40
227	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.23	3.00	3.00	3.38	3.23	2.92	3.11	3.11
228	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.25	3.31	3.15	3.78	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.27
229	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	3.63	3.38	3.00	3.22	4.50	3.77	3.69	3.00	3.50
230	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.13	3.92	3.92	3.67	3.00	2.85	3.23	2.78	3.44
231	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.38	4.00	3.69	3.75	3.00	3.08	2.83	3.00	3.46
232	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	2.75	2.92	2.85	2.78	1.13	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.93
233	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	2.88	3.15	3.46	3.56	1.57	2.46	1.58	1.00	2.52
234	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	3.00	2.85	3.00	2.67	2.43	2.50	2.30	1.38	2.56
235	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.71	4.85	4.69	4.63	2.00	2.00	1.31	1.00	3.12
236	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.38	2.25	1.25	1.00	2.79
237	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	3.38	3.77	2.77	3.00	1.13	1.15	1.15	1.00	2.17
238	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.75	3.69	3.85	3.78	2.25	1.69	1.38	1.33	2.70
239	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	2.63	2.54	2.92	2.44	1.00	1.15	1.00	1.22	1.87
240	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	3.75	3.69	3.77	3.56	2.75	1.77	1.46	2.22	2.83
170	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
171	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.75	4.77	3.69	4.00	2.88	2.54	2.38	3.33	3.50
172	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE	3.88	3.15	3.15	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.92	3.00	3.12
173	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.13	3.75	4.46	4.11	4.00	3.77	4.00	4.00	4.02
174	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.50	3.69	3.08	3.00	2.88	2.46	1.77	1.78	2.76
175	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	1	4.63	5.00	5.00	4.78	4.86	5.00	4.77	5.00	4.89
176	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.63	4.85	5.00	4.78	2.00	1.85	1.08	1.11	3.14
177	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	4.75	4.54	4.42	4.33	1.75	1.62	1.31	2.00	3.05
178	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	5.00	4.69	4.38	5.00	1.38	1.77	1.62	1.33	3.14
179	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.13	2.91	2.77	2.44	2.14	1.38	2.00	2.33	2.35
180	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.13	3.62	3.31	3.44	3.00	3.08	2.85	2.89	3.17
181	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	2.63	3.00	3.08	2.78	3.00	2.54	2.77	3.00	2.85
182	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	3.88	3.85	3.54	3.44	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.58
183	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	1 TO 5	1	2.63	2.23	2.54	2.33	1.88	1.31	1.33	1.67	1.96
184	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.63	4.77	3.31	3.33	3.75	3.92	4.20	4.22	3.94
185	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.31	3.09	2.89	3.25	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.04
186	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	2.75	2.83	2.92	2.63	2.63	1.85	1.31	1.33	2.25
187	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.00	3.92	3.85	3.89	2.00	2.23	2.00	2.00	2.99
188	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.38	2.77	3.00	3.00	2.91
189	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	2.71	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.98
190	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	2.75	3.45	3.67	3.22	2.75	2.54	3.00	3.00	3.06
191	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	3.13	2.85	3.31	2.78	2.75	2.38	2.62	2.44	2.78
242	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.89	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.99

DATA BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHER

- (1) ASSESSMENT
(2) CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
(3) SKILL DEVELOPMENT
(4) TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

IO	SCHCOL ASSIGNMENT	EDUCATION	YEARS EXPERIENCE	NUMBER OF COURSES	NEEDS				SERVICES				TOTAL
					1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
243	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.88	3.77	4.00	3.89	2.25	2.46	2.38	2.11	3.10
246	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	1	3.63	3.31	2.92	2.89	3.13	2.69	3.00		3.05
247	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.25	3.33	3.08	3.13	4.13	3.75	4.00		3.50
248	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.88	4.77	4.46	4.63	1.50	1.00	1.46	1.33	3.14
249	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.00	2.92	2.89	2.50	1.38	1.38	1.22	2.25
250	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.88	2.92	2.77	2.11	3.94
251	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.75	4.62	4.54	5.00	2.75	2.62	2.62	2.25	3.61
252	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	1 TO 5	2	2.38	2.08	2.46	2.22	1.25	1.15	1.22		1.84
253	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.25	3.92	3.15	3.78	3.13	3.31	2.85	3.22	3.33
254	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	2.88	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00		2.99
255	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	3.50	3.31	3.00	3.00	2.88	3.00	2.92	2.78	3.05
256	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.43	3.85	3.69	4.00	2.38	2.62	2.85	2.78	3.21
257	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.38	4.00	3.77	3.33	3.63	4.15	3.00	3.44	3.71
258	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	3.50	4.31	3.54	4.33	2.38	2.92	3.08	3.11	3.42
259	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.50	4.54	4.08	4.33	3.38	3.54	3.46	3.67	3.93
260	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.38	4.77	4.62	4.89	4.63	4.92	5.00	4.89	4.78
261	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.13	4.69	4.92	4.89	3.00	3.23	2.85	3.33	3.88
262	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.50	4.62	4.38	3.78	3.88	4.08	3.46	3.22	4.01
263	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.63	2.38	2.38	2.44	3.22
264	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	5.00	4.92	4.38	4.00	4.13	4.15	3.77	3.89	4.28
265	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.13	4.92	4.92	5.00	3.75	4.25	4.62	4.78	4.59
267	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.83	3.31	3.56	3.00	2.69	1.67	2.33	2.92
268	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.29	4.62	3.83	4.33	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.11
269	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	1	2.38	2.62	2.62	2.89	2.43	2.54	1.54	1.44	2.31
270	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	2	3.75	4.00	4.00	3.78	2.25	2.46	2.92	2.89	3.28
271	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.94
272	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE	3.38	3.23	3.08	3.11	3.00	3.00	3.08	3.00	3.10
273	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.50	4.23	4.23	4.00	1.88	1.08	1.15	1.33	2.67
274	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.13	4.31	3.33	3.33	1.38	1.75	1.67	1.50	2.71
275	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.67	3.90	4.09	3.22	2.50	2.77	2.73	3.38	3.26
276	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50
277	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.26
278	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	1	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50
279	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10		3.88	4.85	4.67	4.44	4.86	4.83	4.17	4.56	4.55
285	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	2.63	3.00	3.31	3.33	3.25	2.85	3.38	3.22	3.13
286	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.13	4.38	3.69	4.00	2.25	1.85	2.08	2.00	3.03
288	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	3.38	3.23	3.23	3.22	2.25	1.92	1.85	1.89	2.60
299	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.50	3.54	3.23	3.78	3.38	2.77	3.00	3.00	3.24
300	ELEMENTARY		MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.13	4.62	4.54	4.56	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.22	4.58
301	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	4.63	4.85	4.69	5.00	3.63	3.85	3.08	3.33	4.13

(CONTINUED)

DATA BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHER

- (1) ASSESSMENT
 (2) CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
 (3) SKILL DEVELOPMENT
 (4) TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

SCHOOL		YEARS		NUMBER		NEEDS				SERVICES				TOTAL
ID	ASSIGNMENT	EDUCATION	EXPERIENCE	OF COURSES		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
302	ELEMENTARY	SPECIALIST	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.75	4.92	4.85	5.00	1.75	2.77	3.31	3.33	3.82
303	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.75	3.77	3.38	3.63	1.63	2.69	2.62	2.67	3.04
304	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.63	4.38	3.69	3.89	3.38	2.85	3.23	2.67	3.57
305	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.80	3.62	4.00	3.38
306	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		3.00	4.00	3.42	3.38	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.29
307	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.38	3.15	2.77	3.00	3.13	2.31	2.31	2.22	2.74
308	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		3.00	3.00	2.92	2.89	1.00	2.08	1.25	2.00	2.30
318	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	2		3.38	3.77	3.46	2.89	3.25	3.36	2.88	2.78	3.27
329	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		3.25	3.69	3.83	4.00	2.50	2.62	2.54	2.67	3.14
330	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		4.00	3.54	3.23	3.44	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.30
331	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.13	5.00	4.92	4.89	2.75	2.31	2.00	2.00	3.51
332	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		4.25	4.31	4.00	4.22	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.15
338	ELEMENTARY	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		4.13	3.77	3.46	3.33	3.00	2.77	2.85	2.67	3.23
340	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.13	2.08	2.15	2.00	3.05
347	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		3.13	3.46	3.69	3.22	3.00	2.92	2.92	2.89	3.17
348	ELEMENTARY	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		4.43	4.92	5.00	5.00	1.50	1.31	2.15	2.33	3.33
16	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		3.50	3.69	3.50	3.67	2.75	2.62	2.46	2.50	3.08
19	MIDDLE	MASTERS	16 TO 20	2		3.00	3.15	3.54	2.89	1.13	1.54	1.15	1.56	2.27
20	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		3.88	3.62	3.92	3.40	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.35
32	MIDDLE	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		4.00	4.69	4.50	4.67	3.88	4.00	4.44	4.60	4.36
37	MIDDLE	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		5.00	4.85	4.69	5.00	5.00	4.77	4.31	4.56	4.74
50	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		3.00	3.00	2.92	3.29	3.75	3.83	2.85	2.67	3.14
51	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		3.00	3.00	2.92	3.33	3.75	3.92	2.85	2.67	3.17
86	MIDDLE	MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		3.25	3.38	3.69	3.33	2.50	2.23	2.46	2.38	2.92
90	MIDDLE	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		2.75	3.31	3.08	2.78	3.38	2.54	2.54	2.67	2.87
102	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE		4.00	4.08	4.15	4.00	4.17	3.31	3.46	3.33	3.79
147	MIDDLE	MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE		4.50	4.85	4.62	4.67	2.00	2.17	2.15	2.38	3.45
192	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	1		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.63	2.77	2.69	2.89	2.87
199	MIDDLE	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.50
213	MIDDLE	MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE		4.25	4.54	3.85	4.00	3.00	2.58	2.00	2.00	3.27
224	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	11 TO 15	2		3.00	2.92	2.92	2.67	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.44
244	MIDDLE	MASTERS	6 TO 10	2		2.88	4.38	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00		3.53
245	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	1		4.38	4.23	3.92	3.44	3.75	3.38	3.11		3.75
266	MIDDLE	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		4.88	4.69	4.69	4.33	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.83
287	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	16 TO 20			3.25	3.62	3.08	2.89	1.63	1.23	1.00	1.00	2.21
292	MIDDLE	MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE		5.00	4.77	4.92	4.75	2.13	2.77	2.38	2.50	3.67
310	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	6 TO 10	2		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
311	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	5 TO 10	2		3.75	3.69	3.46	3.44	2.75	1.54	2.23	2.00	2.83
312	MIDDLE	BACHELORS	1 TO 5	2		3.25	4.08	3.31	3.67	3.43	2.33	2.77	2.33	3.14
313	MIDDLE	MASTERS	16 TO 20	2		3.00	3.00	4.00	3.78	2.25	2.77	2.77	3.00	3.09

(CONTINUED)

DATA BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHER

- (1) ASSESSMENT
 (2) CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
 (3) SKILL DEVELOPMENT
 (4) TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

ID	SCHOOL	ASSIGNMENT	EDUCATION	YEARS EXPERIENCE	NUMBER OF COURSES	NEEDS				SERVICES				TOTAL
						1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
315	MIDDLE		MASTERS	11 TO 15	1	3.00	2.85	2.92	3.00	2.25	2.31	2.08	1.89	2.52
316	MIDDLE		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	1	2.75	3.00	2.77	2.89	3.00	2.77	2.85	3.00	2.87
317	MIDDLE		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	2	3.38	3.15	3.46	2.89	3.00	2.85	2.62	2.56	2.99
319	MIDDLE		MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	4.00	4.00	3.69	2.78	1.25	1.46	1.17	1.11	2.47
335	MIDDLE		MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	5.00	4.92	4.85	4.75	1.38	2.15	1.85	1.44	3.31
337	MIDDLE		MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	3.50	3.23	3.23	3.33	1.88	2.38	1.67	3.00	2.75
339	MIDDLE		MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.38	3.62	3.46	3.56	2.50	2.58	2.46	2.11	2.98
341	MIDDLE		MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.44	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.84
342	MIDDLE		BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.25	4.77	4.85	3.78	1.75	1.92	2.08	1.44	3.16
17	HIGH		BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.13	4.00	4.92	5.00	2.00	2.00	1.92	1.00	3.14
21	HIGH		SPECIALIST	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	5.00	5.00	4.15	4.11	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.78
22	HIGH		DOCTORAL	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	4.75	4.38	4.54	4.33	2.71	3.69	3.08	3.75	3.93
23	HIGH		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.75	4.15	3.54	4.00	2.25	2.15	1.54	2.33	2.94
25	HIGH		MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.88	2.46	2.08	2.00	3.13
47	HIGH		MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.56	3.00	2.92	2.69	2.67	3.64
48	HIGH		MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.00	4.00	3.85	3.78	3.25	3.08	3.15	3.11	3.52
49	HIGH		MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	2	2.75	3.00	3.00	3.25	2.63	2.69	3.62	3.00	3.01
57	HIGH		MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	5.00	4.85	4.54	4.44	2.88	2.31	2.00	2.22	3.50
58	HIGH		MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.88	4.92	4.92	5.00	3.00	2.92	2.77	3.00	3.92
60	HIGH		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	4.63	3.92	4.46	3.67	1.50	2.23	2.00	1.89	3.07
61	HIGH		MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.88	4.92	4.62	4.44	1.50	2.15	1.00	1.56	3.14
113	HIGH		MASTERS	11 TO 15	2	2.38	2.77	3.23	3.11	1.63	1.77	2.08	1.44	2.34
115	HIGH		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	2	4.25	3.69	4.46	3.78	2.00	1.23	1.92	1.56	2.85
116	HIGH		MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.00	1.25	1.15	1.11	3.09
117	HIGH		MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.29	1.08	1.00	1.00	3.08
125	HIGH		BACHELORS	16 TO 20		4.00	4.67	4.33	4.44	3.13	3.77	3.33		4.00
148	HIGH		BACHELORS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.75	4.38	4.23	4.43	1.86	2.31	2.67	2.78	3.43
152	HIGH		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	2	2.88	3.23	3.08	3.00	2.13	2.08	2.00	1.44	2.51
153	HIGH		SPECIALIST	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.13	4.46	4.92	4.11	2.25	2.45	1.77	1.44	3.25
154	HIGH		BACHELORS	16 TO 20	2	4.25	3.77	3.77	4.00	1.13	1.15	1.23	1.00	2.52
169	HIGH		BACHELORS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE	3.00	4.83	4.00	3.78	2.50	2.58	2.27	2.38	3.25
200	HIGH		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	1	2.88	2.77	2.85	2.67	3.00	2.92	2.92	2.89	2.86
209	HIGH		BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	3.63	3.46	3.77	3.67	2.50	2.15	2.00	2.00	2.89
210	HIGH		BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.63	3.15	3.50	3.43	2.13	1.92	2.38	2.25	2.77
211	HIGH		SPECIALIST	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.88	3.54	4.00	4.00	2.88	3.08	3.15	3.11	3.45
212	HIGH		MASTERS	6 TO 10	2	3.50	3.62	3.85	3.56	2.00	2.15	2.38	2.11	2.92
280	HIGH		MASTERS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE	3.75	2.85	3.38	2.67	2.00	2.00	2.69	2.00	2.67
281	HIGH		MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.38	3.77	4.54	3.80	4.25	4.54	3.77	4.33	4.18
282	HIGH		MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	4.00	4.00	3.92	3.89	2.13	1.77	1.77	2.00	2.89
283	HIGH		MASTERS	6 TO 10	2	2.25	2.38	3.54	2.00	1.63	1.55	1.15	1.44	2.04

(CONTINUED)

DATA BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHER

- (1) ASSESSMENT
 (2) CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
 (3) SKILL DEVELOPMENT
 (4) TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGIES

ID	SCHOOL	ASSIGNMENT	EDUCATION	YEARS EXPERIENCE	NUMBER OF COURSES	NEEDS				SERVICES				TOTAL
						1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
284	HIGH		MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.88	4.38	4.23	5.00	2.25	2.08	2.15	2.00	3.34
289	HIGH		BACHELORS		3 OR MORE	4.50	4.69	4.85	4.78	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.86
290	HIGH		MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.88	3.69	3.08	3.44	2.63	2.85	2.62	2.56	3.08
291	HIGH		MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	4.00	3.31	3.85	4.00	2.00	2.23	2.23	2.33	2.98
293	HIGH		MASTERS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE	3.88	4.15	4.00	3.67	1.25	1.75	1.69	1.78	2.80
294	HIGH		MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	2.88	3.00	3.92	2.89	1.88	1.38	1.85	1.44	2.43
295	HIGH		MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.63	4.23	3.85	4.00	3.38	3.38	3.15	2.89	3.67
296	HIGH		MASTERS	16 TO 20	1	2.75	2.85	3.38	2.33	1.63	2.00	2.08	2.00	2.42
297	HIGH		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.38	3.31	3.62	3.78	2.25	1.85	1.92	2.00	2.75
298	HIGH		MASTERS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.88	3.92	3.62	3.78	1.88	1.85	1.62	2.11	2.81
309	HIGH		BACHELORS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.75	4.00	4.33	3.88					4.03
320	HIGH		MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	3.63	3.77	3.77	3.44	1.75	2.00	2.08	2.78	2.91
321	HIGH		MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.50	3.38	3.77	3.60	2.88	2.38	2.31	2.44	2.99
322	HIGH		MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	4.88	4.00	5.00	3.33	4.50	3.77	3.23	2.00	3.85
323	HIGH		MASTERS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE	4.38	3.54	3.77	3.33	1.00	1.00	1.46	2.00	2.53
324	HIGH		BACHELORS	16 TO 20	2	3.25	2.92	2.92	2.88	4.00	4.17	4.11	4.38	3.53
325	HIGH		MASTERS	1 TO 5		4.14	4.36	3.91	3.44	2.75	2.00	2.31	3.00	3.16
326	HIGH		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	2.63	2.62	2.46	2.44	3.00	2.92	3.00	2.89	2.74
328	HIGH		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.38	3.23	3.54	3.44	2.38	2.15	2.46	2.44	2.87
333	HIGH		BACHELORS	1 TO 5	3 OR MORE	2.25	1.92	2.31	2.00	1.13	1.33	1.15	1.44	1.69
334	HIGH		BACHELORS	6 TO 10	3 OR MORE	3.50	3.83	3.69	3.33	2.50	2.69	2.62	2.22	3.07
336	HIGH		MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	3.50	2.92	3.08	2.78	3.00	2.69	2.54	2.67	2.87
343	HIGH		MASTERS	16 TO 20	3 OR MORE	3.63	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.56
344	HIGH		MASTERS	MORE THAN 20	3 OR MORE	5.00	4.58	4.38	4.33	1.00	2.44	2.58	3.00	3.46
345	HIGH		BACHELORS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.50	4.62	4.46	4.33	3.00	3.00	2.77	2.67	3.67
346	HIGH		MASTERS	11 TO 15	3 OR MORE	4.25	4.08	4.00	4.00	1.63	2.15	2.23	2.44	3.10

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles and Periodicals

- "A Statement by the Organization for the Essentials of Education." The Reading Teacher 34 (May 1981): 935-937.
- Adams, Mary L. "Teachers' Instructional Needs in Teaching Reading." The Reading Teacher 17 (January 1964): 260-264.
- Allen, Sheilar M., and Chester, Robert D. "A Needs Assessment Instrument for Secondary Reading Inservice." The Journal of Reading 21 (March 1978): 389-492.
- Blumberg, Arthur. "Supervisory Behavior and Interpersonal Relations." Educational Administration Quarterly 4 (Spring 1968): 34-45.
- Braam, Leonard S., and Walker, James E. "Subject Teachers' Awareness of Reading Skills." Journal of Reading 16 (May 1973): 608-611.
- Burnham, Reba M. "Instructional Supervision: Past, Present and Future Perspectives." Theory Into Practice 15 (October 1976): 301-305.
- Claye, Clifton M. "Lola Gets What Lola Wants from Supervision." The Journal of Educational Research 56 (March 1963): 358-361.
- Cruickshank, Donald R.; Kennedy, John J.; and Myers, Betty. "Problems of Beginning Secondary Teachers in Relation to School Location." Journal of Educational Research 69 (January 1970): 167-172.
- Fuller, Frances F. "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization." American Educational Research Journal 6 (March 1969): 207-225.
- Hayes, Andrew E., and Jones, Linda L. "How Valid Are Surveys of Teacher Needs." Educational Leadership (February 1980): 390-392.

- Ingersoll, Gary M. "Assessing Inservice Training Needs Through Teacher Responses." The Journal of Teacher Education 27 (Summer 1976): 169-173.
- Ingersoll, Gary M., and Schneider, Ruth A. "Perceived Inservice Needs Among Elementary Teachers." Viewpoints Teachers and Learning 54 (October 1978): 20-26.
- Jackson, James E. "Reading in the Secondary School: A Survey of Teachers." Journal of Reading 23 (December 1979): 229-232.
- Micklos, John. "Reading Achievement in the United States." Journal of Reading 25 (May 1982): 760-762.
- Otto, Wayne, and Smith, Richard J. "Elementary Teachers' Preferences for Pre-Service and In-Service Training in the Teaching of Reading." The Journal of Educational Research 53 (July-August 1970): 445-449.
- Pataniezek, Dennis, and Sesacson, Nancy S. "The Relationship of Socialization and Concerns of Beginning Secondary Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education 32 (May-June 1981): 14-17.
- Pigge, Fred L. "Teacher Competencies: Need, Proficiency, and Where Proficiency was Developed." Journal of Teacher Education 29 (July/August 1978): 70-76.
- Robinson, Richard D. "Staff Development and the Disabled Readers." Journal of Research and Development in Education 14 (May 1981): 74-79.

Books

- Fox, David J. The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Fuchs, Estelle. Teacher Talk: Views from Inside City Schools. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing Company, 1967.
- Fuller, Frances F., and Brown, O. H. "Becoming A Teacher." In Teacher Education, Part II, The Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Study of Education. Edited by K. Ryan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Gates, Authur I. Improvement of Reading. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1929.

Leedy, Paul D. Practical Research: Planning and Design.
New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1974.

Oppenheim, A, N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc. Publishers, 1966.

Sefiovanni, Thomas J., and Starratt, Robert J. Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.

VanderWerf, L. S. How to Evaluate Teachers and Teaching.
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958.

Dissertations

Briscoe, Frederick G. "The Professional Concerns of First Year Secondary Teachers in Selected Michigan Public Schools: A Pilot Study." Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1979.

Cardenas, Jose A. "Role Expectation for Instructional Supervisors as Expressed by Selected Supervisors, Administrators and Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1966.

Issacson, Nancy S. "A Description of the Nature and Extent of Support Systems as Perceived by Beginning Secondary Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1978.

Pataniezek, Dennis. "A Descriptive Study of Concerns of First Year Teachers who are Graduates of the Secondary Education Pilot Program at Michigan State University." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978.

VITA

V I T A

JOSEPHINE WILLIAMS JACKSON

3770 Rockport Place, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30331

PERSONAL DATA:

Married to Ernest Cromwell Jackson, Sr.
Children: Candace Ernine Jackson
Ernest Cromwell Jackson, Jr.
Christa Estelle Jackson
Caree Joli Jackson

EDUCATION:

Bachelor of Science
Major: French
Fort Valley State College
Fort Valley, Georgia

Masters of Arts
Reading Specialist
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

Education Specialist
Reading
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia

PROFESSIONAL
EXPERIENCE:

Elementary Classroom Teacher
Bibb County Public Schools
Macon, Georgia

Elementary Classroom Teacher
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

Lead Teacher
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

Resource Teacher
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

Program Administrator
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

JOSEPHINE WILLIAMS JACKSON

Page 2.

**PROFESSIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS:**

International Reading Association
Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development
Phi Delta Kappa
Georgia Association of Educational
Leaders
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority